

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## THE THEATRE LAW OF THE OLD PROVINCE OF WESTMINSTER

BY THE RIGHT REV. MGR. CANON MYERS, M.A.

I. 1647-1753

**W**HEN Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, Vicar-Apostolic of England (from 1625 to 1655) issued in 1647 his brief *MONITA quaedam utilia pro sacerdotibus seminaristis Missionariis Angliae*, he contented himself with remarking that it would be superfluous to admonish them about dicing, taverns, hunting, comedies and other such like things forbidden to priests by the Sacred Canons,<sup>1</sup> which they are in honour bound to observe more strictly than Regulars their Rule, seeing the greater authority whence they derive, the greater good they serve, the Seminary Oath whereby they undertook to observe them.

Stimulated by the recently published Encyclical of Pope Benedict XIV (1740-1758) Bishop Benjamin Petre<sup>2</sup> issued in 1741 *MONITA quaedam pro sacerdotibus Missionariis*, embodying more detailed directions to the clergy. In par. II he reminded his clergy that "sloth, the source of all vice, should be driven far from them. For it is most disgraceful that Priests (whose duty it is to lead the rest of the faithful, and to be shining lights in the narrow and toilsome path of salvation, and to urge them both by word and example to care for Christian perfection) should lead a lazy life, indulge in sleep, or waste their precious time in taverns or other public

<sup>1</sup> De aleis, tabernis, venationibus, comoediis et aliis huiusmodi, quae per Sacros Canones prohibentur Sacerdotibus, superfluum esset eos admonere (§29).

<sup>2</sup> He had been consecrated on November 11th, 1721, Bishop of Prusa and Coadjutor of Bishop Giffard, and on the latter's death succeeded as Vicar Apostolic of the London District, March 12th, 1734. He died December 22nd, 1758.

houses, in evening drinking parties, in playing dice or cards, in profane plays, in public games, in hunting and such like things, all of which have been forbidden to clerics as unbecoming their ecclesiastical state."<sup>3</sup>

The year 1753 brought with it the long-desired settlement of the controversy between the Vicars-Apostolic and the Regulars. The Brief "*Apostolicum Ministerium*" issued by Benedict XIV on May 30th, 1753, "under the ring of the Fisherman," is generally known as *Regulae Observandae in Anglicanis Missionibus*. These "Rules of the Mission" remained the chief constitutional regulations for the Church in England until the Restoration of the Hierarchy. In § 18, the Pope charges the Vicars-Apostolic to see that the Secular Missionaries behave in a virtuous and becoming manner so as to be a good example to others; that they are ready to carry out the sacred offices, to give suitable instruction to the people, and to attend to the sick; that they take care to avoid public assembles of idle folk and especially taverns. They may add the penalty of suspension against anyone who does not avoid the latter.<sup>4</sup>

A Latin letter communicating faculties was addressed to the Clergy of the London District on October 5th, 1753, and signed by Bishop Petre and by Bishop Challoner, his coadjutor. It draws the Clergy's attention to the chief points of the Papal Brief and towards the end (p. 14) urges the Clergy to lead lives worthy of their vocation, to carefully avoid sloth, the source of all vices, and not to waste uselessly their precious time. Urged on by the

<sup>3</sup> Longe denique a nobis abigatur desidia, vitiorum omnium parens; turpissimum enim est sacerdotes (qui caeteris fidelibus praeire et praelucere deberent in arcta et laboriosa salutis via, eosque verbo et exemplo ad Christianae perfectionis studium excitare) desidiosam vitam agere, somno indulgere, aut pretiosum suum tempus prodigere in popinis, vel aliis domibus publicis, in nocturnis compotatorum societatibus, in aleae aut chartarum lusu, in spectaculis profanis, in ludis publicis, in venatione et similibus, quae omnia, tamquam statum ecclesiasticum dedecentia, clericis per sacros canones interdicta sunt."

<sup>4</sup> "Sedulo igitur incumbant Vicarii Apostolici, ut Missionarii Saeculares probe, honesteque in omnibus se gerant, quo aliis bono exemplo sint; et imprimis Sacris Officiis celebrandis, opportunisque institutionibus populo tradendis, atque infirmis opera sua sublevandis praesto sint, ut a publicis otiosorum coetibus, et cauponis omnimode caveant; *addita etiam suspensionis poena* cuilibet, si quis ad easdem divertere non vereretur."

Pope's advice, they forbid, under penalty of suspension to be inflicted by them, all secular missionaries to frequent taverns without need, still more to spend the evening in drinking or playing cards in such places; ever to be present at comedies or other theatrical plays; to take part in public assembles and games of idle people, or to go to gambling houses which they regret are so much frequented by Catholics, with a great loss of money and of precious time, even during sacred seasons and on Sundays themselves, not without scandal to many.<sup>5</sup>

## II. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND.

Reading the Petre-Challoner Pastoral in the light of the history of the eighteenth century in England we are at once struck by the clearness with which the Vicars Apostolic read the signs of the times. "The drinking of the eighteenth century went far beyond anything ever recorded; all classes alike drank; they began to drink hard somewhere about the year 1730, and they kept it up for a hundred years . . . The clergy, grave and sober merchants, lawyers, judges, the most responsible people drank freely; men about town, officers, Templars, tradesmen drank more than freely; the lowest classes spent all their money in drink, especially in gin, upon which they could get drunk for two pence. In the year 1736 there were 7,044 gin-shops in London—one house in six, and 3,200 alehouses where gin was secretly sold."<sup>6</sup>

"The two principal vices of a century which practised them all . . . were drinking and gambling. It is difficult to say which of the two was the more fatal or the more widely spread. Probably the former would claim the larger following and the more numerous victims. In the city every kind of business was transacted at the tavern and nothing was concluded

<sup>5</sup> Quapropter Apostolicis monitis excitati, prohibemus sub poena suspensionis a nobis infligenda, omnibus Missionariis Saecularibus, ne cauponas absque necessitate frequentent; multoque magis ne in iis vespertinas hores computando, aut chartis ludendo insumant; ne comoediis, aut aliis theatrorum spectaculis, unquam intersint; ne publicis otiosorum coetibus et ludis essocientur; denique ne lusorum conventibus, quos a Catholicis cum magno pecuniae et pretiosi temporis dispendio (etiam temporibus sacris, atque adeo ipsis etiam diebus Dominicis, non sine multorum scandalo) tantopere frequentari dolemus, se unquam immisceant.

<sup>6</sup> *London*, by Walter Besant (1894), p. 319.

without a bottle. The morning draught was common in the early part of the century, though it vanished later on; the men who dined together sat down early and rose up late. The higher one mounted in rank the more one drank; almost every member of the Royal Family except the King drank heavily. Port and punch were the principal drinks of the upper classes. It was considered bad form not to leave the feast half-drunk, at least."

Readers of Boswell's *Life of Dr. Johnson* will remember his eulogy of the English Tavern (Birrell's Edit., 1901, vol. iii, p. 290), and will bear in mind that his sententious utterances were made for the benefit of a crowd of admirers gathered together at regular intervals in a room of some London Tavern. London tavern-life and its importance to all men in the eighteenth century will be found set out in Wagner's *London Inns and Taverns* (1924).

Dr. Challoner saw the danger besetting his small band of clergy from the prevailing habits of the times and warned them against practices which it was left to subsequent historians to deplore.

During the Puritan ascendancy all theatrical amusements were prohibited. With the Restoration, theatres were re-established and Royal Patents granted to Killigrew and Davenant in 1662 for their theatres in Drury Lane and Covent Garden, the one enjoying the official patronage of Charles II, the others the patronage of the Duke of York. The profligacy of the theatre during the generation that followed the Restoration can hardly be exaggerated. By the time of the Revolution, however, the movement of dissipation had somewhat spent its force. In Lecky (vol. ii, pp. 179 foll.) will be found details making it quite clear that throughout the century the English stage was far inferior to that of France in decorum, modesty and morality, although a distinct improvement is noted as the century progresses. The influence of Garrick, while elevating incalculably the standard of theatrical taste, contributed also not a little to free his profession from the discredit under which it laboured. Lecky concludes (p. 191): "But, on the whole, the religious

<sup>7</sup> *London in the Eighteenth Century*, by Sir Walter Besant (1902), p. 296 foll. Cf. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (1892), VII, 197.



prejudice against the theatre in the first sixty years of the eighteenth century was probably much less strong than it afterwards became, through the influence of the Methodists and Evangelicals."

In addition to the strong anti-theatrical feeling in English religious circles, the Vicars-Apostolic were influenced by the very rigorist views prevailing in the Church of France.<sup>8</sup> The classical exposition of that teaching will be found in Bossuet's *Maximes et Reflexions sur la Comédie*<sup>9</sup> (1694): "L'Eglise même, dit Saint Augustin, 'n'exerce sa sévérité de ses censures que sur les pécheurs dont le nombre n'est pas grand: *severitas exercenda est in peccata paucorum*'; c'est pourquoi elle condamne les comédiens, et croit par-là défendre assez la comédie: la décision en est précise dans les Rituels, la pratique en est constante: on prive des sacraments, et à la vie et à la mort, ceux qui jouent la comédie, s'ils ne renoncent à leur art; on les passe à la sainte table comme des pécheurs publics; on les exclut des ordres sacrés comme des personnes infâmes; par une suite infaillible, la sepulture ecclésiastique leur est déniée" (p. 560).

The rigidity of the practice is seen in the case of Molière; he was taken ill on the evening of February 17th, 1673: at nine o'clock he asked for a priest. Two curates of Saint-Eustache refused to come. In the meantime he died without the sacraments whilst a third priest was being sought. The Parish-priest refused him Christian burial. The pressure brought by the King on the Archbishop only obtained that in the night of February 21st, without solemnities, two priests were authorized to bury him. Bossuet's only comment is: "La postérité saura peut-être la fin de ce poète comédien, qui, en jouant son *Malade imaginaire* ou son *Médecin par force*, reçut la dernière atteinte de la maladie dont il mourut peu d'heures après, et passa des plaisanteries du théâtre, parmi lesquelles il rendit presque le dernier soupir, au tribunal de celui qui dit: Malheur à vous qui riez, car vous pleurerez" (p. 545).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Maugras: Les Comédiens hors la loi*, 2nd Edit., Paris, 1887.

<sup>9</sup> Versailles Edition, 1818, vol. 37. I have not been able to consult the latest book by Urbain et Levesque: "*L'Eglise et le Théâtre* (Paris: Grasset, 1930. 15 fr.). A study of the development of the Catholic attitude to the theatre and actors.

As late as 1847, Migne's *Encyclopédie Théologique* tells us in the article *COMEDIENS*, "L'excommunication prononcée contre les comédiens, acteurs, actrices tragiques ou comiques, est de la plus grande et de la plus respectable antiquité . . . elle fait partie de la discipline générale de l'Eglise de France . . . Cette Eglise ne leur accorde ni les sacraments, ni la sépulture; elle leur refuse ses suffrages et ses prières, non seulement comme à des infâmes et des pécheurs publics, mais comme à des excommuniés. . . ."

Mgr. Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, rejected this judgment in his *Théologie Morale* (5th Edit., 1848) i, 293-95. He refused to recognize any excommunication. Following the teaching St. Thomas<sup>10</sup> he refused to allow that the actors' profession was bad in itself, although it was dangerous. But even he still hesitates about the dying actor: and thinks the priest in giving the last sacraments to one who is not prepared to give up acting, should simply ask him to promise, in case he recovers, to refer the matter to the bishop's decision. When that declaration is made, the sacraments may be given. If it is obstinately refused "he would evidently be unworthy of the sacraments and of the blessings of the Church" (p. 294).

In the light of both the English and French attitude to the actor and the stage we may be better able to appreciate the extent to which Bishop Milner re-echoes the teaching of Bossuet and others.

Dr. Husenbeth in his *LIFE OF BISHOP MILNER* tells us (p. 112) that "In this year, 1804, Dr. Milner was consulted by the Abbess of the Convent at Winchester, on the lawfulness of theatrical amusements, for her own guidance with regard to the young ladies under her care, at the school conducted by her community. He answered in an admirable Letter, which was published many years afterwards in the *Orthodox Journal* for 1816 [p. 347]. It well deserves an attentive perusal throughout; but its leading points only can be given here. The zealous and pious Bishop observes, that "if there were *no sin whatever*, but barely the danger of sin, or merely a *hindrance to sanctification and perfection* in frequenting plays" still it would be a crime in the

<sup>10</sup> *Secunda Secundae. Q. 168, a. 3.*

clergy, and a betraying of their sacred ministry to expose souls to the danger of sin by any way countenancing theatrical amusements, which are acknowledged by all divines to be "exceedingly dissipating and full of sinful danger." He goes on to say that "everyone knows that actors and actresses, by the laws of the Church, and the particular constitutions of our mission, are considered as habitual sinners, and in a state of damnation, to whom, therefore, the Sacraments are to be denied. Setting aside, then, all other considerations, can any Christian think it lawful, by his or her presence and money, to assist in keeping these wretches in such a state? . . . What are the opinions, the taste, the conduct, and, in a word, the lessons which are inculcated by the theatre? I say, then, that the very best of modern tragedies exhibit and recommend that pride, ambition, vain glory, impatience, anger and revenge, which are the very reverse of our Divine Master's morality, inculcated in the eight beatitudes. They most of them terminate in murder or suicide. And, with respect to all the comedies, together with almost all the tragedies, they are made up of the sentiments, the intrigues, and the gratification of the concupiscence of the flesh, under the specious and all-meaning name of Love. Alas! if the battles of a Christian, with this particular enemy, are so dangerous, and the victories so rare; if our only safety be in flight, as the holy Doctors uniformly assure us what can be expected from him, or her, who voluntarily seeks this foul enemy, when armed with all those powerful weapons, which have been described above?"

In his Pastoral for the following Lent of 1805, the watchful prelate took occasion to warn his flock in these strong terms against theatrical amusements. "How dissipating, dangerous, expensive and ruinous to fortunes as well as to souls, are many of the amusements of the present day! How universal is the passion for theatrical entertainments! and how fatal are the effects of them upon the general morals of the community, no less than upon the consciences of very many innocent and virtuous individuals! Again, how pertinaciously are these defended, as free from all moral danger in spite of reason and experience to the contrary; and in opposition to the concurring testimony of the holy Fathers, and of the Doctors of the Church in modern.

as well as in ancient times, who term them, the *ruin of virtue and morality and the very pest of souls.*"<sup>11</sup>

To show that no lapse of time nor any additional observation or experience, had led him to the least alteration of his convictions on that subject, reference need only be made to another Letter which he sent to the *Orthodox Journal* and which appeared in the number for August in this year [1817; p. 309], but without any date or signature. In these letters he says: "In what terms does the Church speak of the theatre? In the same terms in which Jesus Christ has pronounced the condemnation of the world. Her language, as to the stage, has never varied through the long course of centuries; in her councils, by the voice of her chief prelates, by the mouth of her holy doctors, by the eloquence of her preachers, by her sentence of excommunication against such as follow the profession of actors—in short, by the whole of her doctrine and practice."<sup>12</sup>

### III. 1803.

On May 22nd, 1803, Bishop John Milner received episcopal consecration as Bishop of Castabala, and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. Bishop John Douglass of the London District was the consecrating prelate and was assisted by Bishop William Gibson of the Northern District and Bishop William Sharrock, O.S.B., of the Western District. The ceremony took place in Bishop Milner's own Chapel at Winchester. Dr. Poynter, recently appointed Coadjutor of Bishop Douglass, was also present.

The Vicars Apostolic and the Clergy they had summoned took the opportunity of holding what Bishop Douglass in his Diary designates as a "Synod" from May 23rd to 25th. At the second session, Bishop Milner "proposed to the consideration of their Lordships the ambiguous clause of the Instructions attached to the form of the faculties of Missionaries by which Priests of the Secular Clergy are forbidden to go to plays. Considering the ambiguity of the clause, and the unhappy practice of some clergymen who are known to have frequented the Theatres, it was judged proper to express the prohibition

<sup>11</sup> *Husenbeth*, p. 113.

<sup>12</sup> *Husenbeth*, p. 344.

in precise terms under pain of suspension *ipso facto* against those who violate it. It being observed that besides the Theatres there are other dangerous places of amusement where a priest cannot appear without detriment to his character, or danger to his morals and scandal to the people, the propriety of specifying some of the more noted places of that description was considered. But it was concluded to be more prudent to use the term Theatres in the general prohibition to be inserted in the instructions addressed to the missionaries, whilst each Bishop may forbid under the same penalty such places in his own district as he shall judge to fall under the general description."<sup>13</sup> In the course of the Third Session it was thought advisable that Bishop Milner should publish in his own name a Pastoral Instruction on the occasion of his entering into his district, "but that he should not promulgate in this Instruction the suspension *ipso facto* agreed upon against those clergymen, who shall go to plays or other improper places of public divertisement." "Nevertheless, that it would be proper to promulgate the aforesaid censure of suspension in the revised Instructions annexed to the formula of the Priests' faculties, as soon as possible."

The Vicars Apostolic then went together from Winchester to Old Hall, where on Whit-Sunday, May 29th, 1903, Dr. Poynter was consecrated Bishop of Halia in the Old Chapel of St. Edmund's College. Bishop Milner preached at the ceremony.

On the following day, May 30th, "The four Vicars Apostolic of the four Districts, with the Coadjutor of the V.A. of the London District (Bishop Poynter) and the Rev. Dr. Coombes (Vice-President of St. Edmund's) assembled at Old Hall Green to deliberate further on certain points of Ecclesiastical discipline, in an appendix to the late Synod. The Rev. Dr. Coombes swore to the Profession of faith of Pope Pius IV.

"Some of the articles of the Third Session were read, it having been agreed that the censure of suspension against those who go to the Theatres should be inserted in the Constitutions or Instructions annexed to Priests' faculties, the manner of wording it was considered—and it was agreed that the prohibition and suspension should

<sup>13</sup> *St. Edmund's College Archives. Buff Series, vol. VII.*

be expressed and that moreover Priests should be strongly exhorted to avoid other places unbecoming their character. It was agreed that a new edition of the Instructions annexed to the Faculties should be prepared by the Secretary (Bishop Poynter) of the Synod with the aid of Dr. Coombes."

The Summary of the results of "the Synod" written out at the end of the Minutes has the paragraph: "That the Clergy be and are forbidden to go to plays sub reatu peccati mortalis and under pain of suspension *ipso facto* for the Secular Clergy."

Bishop Poynter's suggested formula is: "Quapropter sub gravi peccati reatu et sub poena suspensionis a sacerdotibus ipso facto incurrendae, in nostris Districtibus prohibetur ne quis de clero comoediis aut aliis publicis ludis scenicis unquam intersit."

The revision of the Instructions took some time and it was not until January 1st, 1804, that Bishop Douglass issued "FACULTATES ET OBSERVANDA IN DISTRICTU LONDINENSI." After a list of the Faculties granted come *Observanda omnibus sacerdotibus ad sacras missiones in nostris districtibus admissis*, the agreed "Rules" signed by the four Vicars Apostolic.

Section XIV, after quoting word for word Bishop Petre's *Monita*, §2, continues: "Gravissime igitur monentur omnes Sacerdotes ut haec devitent. Sciant autem quod sub poenâ suspensionis, sacerdotibus secularibus ipso facto incurrendae, atque adeo sub gravis peccati reatu, in nostris districtibus prohibetur, ne quis de Clero comoediis aut aliis publicis ludis scenicis unquam intersit. Sunt et alii publici coetus in Districto Londinensi, quibus prohibetur, sub eâdem poenâ suspensionis ipso facto similiter incurrendae, ne quis de Clero unquam intersit, viz.—Vauxhall,<sup>14</sup> Opera-Houses,<sup>15</sup> Play-Houses,<sup>16</sup> and all other places of Histrionic Exhibitions; also, Public Oratorios in the evening, Public Concerts in the evening; and all other places of enter-

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Wroth: *The London Pleasure Gardens of the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1896. pp. 286-326.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Edwards: *History of the Opera*, London, 1862, vol. II.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Fitzgerald: *A New History of the English Stage*, London, 1882, vol II.



tainment and amusement where entrance money is received, and which take place in the evening:—save only where literary or philosophical subjects are the *sole* causes of assemblage.”

That legislation was in force until the First Synod of Westminster received approval in Rome. As I write I have before me the “*Facultates et Observanda*,” issued to Dr. Frederick Rymer by Cardinal Wiseman on October 17th, 1851, prolonged for a year by Robert Whitty, V.G., October 17th, 1852, and by John Maguire, V.G., October 1st, 1853.

It is interesting to note that the threat of suspension suggested by Benedict XIV against tavern-frequenting, to which Bishop Petre and Challoner, joined gambling and play-going, now becomes under Bishop Milner’s inspiration a suspension *ipso facto* directed solely against play-going.

Bishop Milner promulgated the *Observanda* in a “Letter to all the Clergy Secular and Regular of the Midland District,” dated from Longburch on December 27th, 1803, he explained that changed circumstances had led the Vicars Apostolic to revise the “Rules for the Conduct of English Missionaries,” and suggests that now they are issued “in the joint name of all the four Vicars Apostolic” they should be given more careful attention. In a footnote on p. xxvii, he explains that “The penalty of suspension, and, of course, the guilt of mortal sin, has ever been denounced by the Vicars Apostolic against any of their Clergy who should be voluntarily present at a single theatrical exhibition. . . . The difference now is, that the sentence which heretofore was only threatened, at present is actually incurred by the transgression in question.”

The moral force of the joint and uniform action of the Vicars Apostolic was no doubt great. But its canonical force seems to call for more careful consideration. Each of the Vicars Apostolic undoubtedly had full authority to make such a law and to inflict such a sanction in his own District, so that there can be no question as to what was the Law and the sanction binding the Clergy of the London District. The same is true respectively of each of the other Districts. But

the "Synod of Winchester" had no collective jurisdiction,<sup>17</sup> and consequently the sanction extended not over the whole of England as a unity, but over the whole of England as made up of four districts, in virtue of the separate jurisdiction exercised over each District. This may be found to have an important bearing on later legislation.

When the Vicars Apostolic met in London in May, 1804, we find in the Minutes of their Meeting a resolution: "That a letter should be written to Rome by the Coadjutor [Bishop Poynter] of the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic of the London District, in which the resolutions entered into at the last meeting and the addition made to the *Observanda* should be mentioned."

Readers of Bishop Ward's *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation* (Vol. I, p. 122) will remember the account of the angry scene at the Clarendon Hotel on February 1st, 1810, when Mr. Archer, the well-known preacher, who had been in the habit of going to the Theatre to take lessons in eloquence, and who resented the prohibition which he traced to Milner, loudly declared that the *Observanda* was "the most ridiculous composition that ever was published." Bishop Milner took up its defence and a storm of fly-leaves and pamphlets followed.

A collective document published over the signatures of the four Vicars Apostolic: Baines, O.S.B., Walsh, Briggs and Griffiths, on May 4th, 1838, under the title: *Monita et Statuta*, extended to all in Major Orders the prohibition of stage plays and the sanction.<sup>18</sup> The same document bids the Clergy warn the faithful against the

<sup>17</sup> Cf. A. Vermeersch, S.J., *Periodica de re canonica et morali*, t. 9 (1921), pp. 32-3. Commenting on can. 304 he says: "Deficiente provincia ecclesiastica, de concilio provinciali agi nequit . . . Nihil tamen impedit quin vicarii et praefecti unius regionis, conventus celebrent ad deliberandum de communibus utilitatibus. Sed conventus iste collectiva jurisdictione carebit, nisi, licentia obtenta S. Sedis, pro vero concilio regionali haberi possit."

<sup>18</sup> Per praesentia insuper notum facimus omnibus, qui sacris ordinibus initiati, in Nostris Districtibus versantur, ut sese abstineant a ludis scenicis ete quae No. 14 "Observanda" cuiquam de clero prohibentur, sub eadem poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrendae, quâ Sacerdotes plecterentur.

prevailing "undress and theatrical spectacles."<sup>19</sup> The severity of the wide-ranging prohibition prevailing in the London District led, it is quite clear, to neglect of its provisions. On April 20th, 1842, we find Bishop Griffiths issuing: *ALIA OBSERVANDA in Districtu Londinensi*. Section VII is as follows: "Cum nobis expositum fuerit aliquos sacerdotes anxie dubitare de effectu suspensionis (XIV *Observanda*) inflictæ, num videlicet invalida fuerit Sacramenti Poenitentiae administratio per Sacerdotem sic suspensum peracta, declaramus validam quamvis illicitam fore eius absolutionem impertitam cum communi populi errore."

From the year 1833 the desirability of a new edition of the *Observanda* comes up regularly at the Bishops' Meetings; Bishop Briggs was commissioned, in 1837, to prepare it. In 1845 the same resolution was repeated, and it was decided that the *Observanda* should be forwarded to the Holy See for approbation. Nothing, however, came of the idea before the Restoration of the Hierarchy.

#### IV. 1852.

When the First Council of Westminster met in July, 1852, it was realized that a drastic change must be made in the type of legislation dealing with ecclesiastical life, and the wide range of prohibitions prevailing since 1804 was reduced in Decree 24, *De vita et honestate clericorum* to this single prohibition: "Prohibemus districtè, ne ecclesiastici sacris ordinibus initiati, scenicis spectaculis in publicis theatris intersint, imponentes transgressoribus poenam suspensionis ipso facto incurrendam, hactenus ubique in Anglia vigentem, cum reservatione respectivo Ordinario."

It will be seen at once what an extraordinary relaxation of the earlier legislation the Westminster Decree represents. The term "stage spectacles" was made as general as possible. A new sanction was added to the existing suspension by reserving it to the Ordinary of the culprit. But there is inserted a clause the meaning

<sup>19</sup> Graviter monete mulieres fideles ut a prava illa consuetudine, quæ jam in virtutis ruinam et animarum perniciem nimis heu invaluit, corpus nudandi potius quam vestiendi abhorreant. Monete omnes, ut a theatrorum spectaculis, quæ plena sunt periculorum, in quibus multi pereant, caute se abstineant."

of which would seem to call for more attention than has hitherto been given to it: the sanction is described as "*poenam suspensionis ipso facto incurrendam hactenus ubique in Anglia vigentem*," the sanction is qualified as that which has hitherto been in force everywhere in England. The reference is to the already existing sanction, not to a new sanction. Historically considered we have seen that "the sanction hitherto prevailing throughout England" was limited in range to the area of the respective districts, if the text of the law is to be construed strictly, then the meaning of the Westminster decree would be different from the meaning usually assigned to it.

The only subsequent modification of the Westminster Theatre Law of 1852 is that made by the Fourth Provincial Council of Westminster held at St. Edmund's in July-August, 1873, when in Decree 11: *De Ordine servando in domibus sacerdotum* section 9 simply repeats as one, sections one and two of the 1852 decree, adding after the words: ". . . in publicis theatris": vel in locis theatri publici usui ad tempus inservientibus.

By Letters Apostolic (*Si qua est*) of October 28th, 1911, Pius X divided the Province of Westminster into three new Provinces, viz.: Westminster, Liverpool and Birmingham.

The New Code of Canon Law was promulgated on May 27th, 1917, and came into force on May 19th, 1918. Many of our readers will remember the eagerness with which the pages of the Code were turned over. The comparative moderation of the sanctionless Canon 140 on Theatres attracted attention. Canon 897 was frequently quoted in discussing the Westminster sanctions, and it was not always noted that Canon 897 and following are merely concerned with episcopal reservation of *sins*, while the reservation of *censures* is dealt with in Canon 2214 and following. There were endless discussions on Canon 6 as to the range of the abrogation of penalties in §5, and the abrogation of laws in §1. Some pointed to Canon 15: *Leges . . . in dubio juris non urgent*"; they were countered by Canon 23: "In dubio revocatio legis praeexistentis non praesumitur. . . ." Others asked where there was room for "doubt" except in the subjective impressions of would be law-breakers. Improvised Canonists got to work and argued that the

jurisdiction which hitherto had been exercised collectively by the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, had undergone modification. That many of the *former* Co-provincials of Westminster are now Co-provincials of Liverpool and Birmingham and may exercise a co-provincial synodal jurisdiction limited to their respective provinces and be the source of the authority of the Councils of Westminster there. And so they argued that the range of the sanctions was limited to the respective Provinces. And there were not wanting those who pointed out that even if the New-Province-basis of the Westminster Decrees were established, there still remained Canon 14, §2, which did indeed exempt "*Peregrini*" from local laws "*iis exceptis quae ordini publico consulunt*" (a phrase new to Canon Law), which, of course, would include laws which cannot be broken without scandal. Then the debate turned off to the purpose of the Law:—was it for the spiritual benefit of the local Clergy or was it for the avoidance of scandal and therefore for the public good? If it was for the former purpose it did not concern *Peregrini*; if for the latter, then, *Peregrini* were equally involved: since, even though their strict obligation to co-operate in the public good might be questioned, they were certainly forbidden to be harmful and a source of scandal.

A more weighty line of attack was that which contended that the existing Westminster Law was actually the subject of *derogatio* by the common law of the Church which did not forbid all "*spectacula, chorea et pompas*" but only such as were unbecoming the Clergy, or would be a source of scandal, particularly if they took place in public theatres; that undoubtedly local censures might be justified by local conditions, but that local conditions to-day were such that the presence of a cleric at a decent play could not be construed as a scandal.

These hypothetical discussions are chronicled from a purely historical point of view, since the Bishops who are the authoritative interpreters of the Law have never given any indication of a modification either of the Law or of its sanctions.

On May 10th, 1918, however, a circular was issued in these terms: "The Hierarchy of England and Wales

direct the attention of the Clergy to the following points arising out of the new Codex of Canon Law: . . . . . An answer has already been received to the effect that the decrees of the four Councils of the original Province of Westminster as it existed before 1911 retain their binding force throughout England and Wales unless they are *contrary* to the Canons of the Codex.

“ Canon 140. The Clergy may not assist at any theatrical or other representations unsuitable in themselves, or at which the presence of a priest is likely to give scandal, and the censures decreed by the Provincial Council of Westminster are still binding throughout the country, precisely as before the erection of the new Provinces.”

By many this was interpreted as an authentic interpretation of the Westminster law and a mitigation of its rigidity in terms of the Code. When, however, the official Roman Decree appeared in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1918; p. 365) it was seen at once that its scope was general not specific. It answered in the affirmative the question: “ Do the laws and decrees of the Provincial Councils of Westminster still retain their binding force, and are they to be strictly kept by all?” It answered in the negative the alternative question: “ or have they ceased to have binding force in the new provinces, and must no longer be held to be valid and stable?”

#### DUBIUM

Circa leges et decreta Conciliorum Provincialium Westmonasteriensium. Quaesitum fuit utrum dismembrata proximis praeteritis annis ecclesiastica provincia Westmonasteriensi, et creatis ex ea novis quatuor provinciis, leges et decreta Conciliorum provincialium Westmonasteriensium, quae praecesserunt, quaeque annis 1852, 1855, 1859 et 1873 celebrata sunt, adhuc vim obligandi habeant et debeant ab omnibus ad unguem servari; an potius in novis provinciis valere cessaverint, nec amplius ea rata ac firma haberi debeant.

Re maturo examini subjecta, SSmus D. N. Benedictus. P. P. XV. jussit responderi:

*Affirmative* ad primam partem, salvis tamen novi Codicis praescriptionibus si et in quantum: legibus et



decretis dictorum Conciliorum derogaverint; *negative* ad secundam partem.

Et mandavit ut resolutio publici juris fieret, eam in *Actis Apostolicæ Sedis* inserendo.

Datum Romæ, ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Consistorialis, die 2 Augusti, 1918. + C. Card. De Lai. Ep. Sabinen. Secretarius.

There still remains unanswered the query: Granted that the Westminster provincial laws bind throughout England as they did before the division of the Province—do they derive their binding-force from the now non-existent Province of Westminster (in the old sense) or from the Bishops of the New Provinces?

The practical application of the answer—whatever it may be—to the Theatre Law is obvious.

Looking at the Theatre Law historically it has been bound up from the first with the pagella of faculties. When in 1753 Bishops Petre and Challoner threatened suspension, when in 1803 the Vicar Apostolic of England inflicted suspension *ipso facto*, when in 1852 the suspension was reserved to the Ordinary the official intimation was conveyed to the individual priest in exactly the same way as it is conveyed to-day, viz., in his "faculties." The legislators in 1803 looked back to the prohibitions of 1753 and added sanctions; the legislators of 1852 intensified the existing sanction, but diminished the range of application.

It is quite certain, at least, that the legislators of 1803 were fully competent within their respective vicariates; it is quite certain that the legislators of 1852 intensified the sanctions within the already existing limits, at least; it is quite certain that the Bishops exercising authority within the limits of the Old Vicariates have maintained the established sanctions down to the present day, and that no priest is authorized to use the faculties granted to him without having his attention drawn to the express reservation of authority to the Bishop in the matter of the violation of the Theatre Law.

## ST. AUGUSTINE ON PEACE AND WAR

BY DOM VINCENT SCULLY, C.R.L., D.S.O.

*The long promised and eagerly awaited Disarmament Conference is to take place at Geneva during the present month. It is obvious that great issues for the peace and security of the world are involved in the success of its deliberations. The Holy See has urged Catholics the world over to work for this cause. At such a time it seems desirable that the magistral teaching of one of the greatest Doctors of the Church on the fundamentals of Peace and War should be presented to the readers of "The Clergy Review."*—The Editors.

THE recent celebration of the fifteenth centenary of St. Augustine of Hippo inevitably suggests a comparison between his times and ours, between the fifth and the twentieth century. And in many respects the conditions are found to be almost startling in their similarity. This applies especially to what may be termed the international political situation. Roman civilization was threatened then, as European civilization seems to some to be threatened to-day. We know that the Empire collapsed and that the Church not only survived, but that she also carried with her into the young barbarian world all that was worth saving of the ancient culture. To the Catholic of the twentieth century, as to the Catholic of the fifth, there is the certainty that the Church cannot fail in the essentials of her divine mission; but as then all else must have appeared dark and doubtful, so also may it well be to us now. We turn therefore with considerable eagerness to question what so great a genius and saint as Augustine of Hippo then felt and thought and taught. And happily we do not turn in vain.

Since the world upheaval of those five years, 1914-1918, the problem of peace and war has been uppermost in the minds of men, not only in its practical and economic aspects, but also most urgently as a moral question. As usual, outside the Church we find extreme positions held and every degree of variety between, in this case, an almost fierce pacifism and a cynical chauvinism. But herein Catholics are increasingly aware of a need on their own part of a surer foothold on principles, and of a more

clear insight into details of practical application; this need is personal, lest they themselves be confused in the welter of conflicting theories, and it is social, that, heirs as they are to the wisdom of the ages, they may be of assistance to others in the difficulties, of which they alone, in and with the divinely guided Church, have the solving principles. A striking instance of the awakened conscience of Catholics and at the same time a notable contribution to the whole discussion of peace and war, is the recent work of the German Dominican, Franciscus Stratmann, published by Sheed and Ward, under the title, *The Church and War*.

The present paper is a brief summary of the mind of St. Augustine on the question, a summary in which the compiler has taken the fullest advantage of the brilliant and exhaustive study of Gustave Combès in his *Doctrine Politique de Saint Augustin*.

When St. Augustine was raised to the See of Hippo the Empire and, with the Empire, the Church were already threatened by the barbarian. The protection of armed force was as necessary to the one as to the other. At such a time the Bishop, intensely patriotic as he was, could have had no patience with the doctrine of peace at any price; it would have appeared to him a most cowardly betrayal.

Yet no one has realized, no one has depicted the horrors of war with greater vividness and detestation than St. Augustine. He will hear of no plea that might mitigate the abomination with which war should be regarded. "But there are just wars. . . . As if the just man, remembering that he is a man, should not be the more afflicted because of this inevitableness of just wars. It is the injustice of his enemies that forces just wars upon the just man."<sup>1</sup> "But the object of war is peace, and peace is the greatest of goods." This St. Augustine freely and frequently admits; but he insists at the same time that a real love of peace would best be shown by a sincere determination and effort to avoid war. And let no man, he cries, speak to me of the glory of war. "Gladiators also fight, they also have their victories. . . . But if a father and a son were to advance on each other as gladiators in the arena, who would bear it, who would

<sup>1</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 7.

not hinder that conflict? How then can the battling of sister states be glorious? Is it because for the arena you have a battlefield, for two dead gladiators an unnumbered multitude of slain, and for spectators, not the amphitheatre but the whole world? ”<sup>2</sup>

However, the times were evil. The Empire was threatened with dissolution. And the pagans did not hesitate to throw the blame on the Christians, declaring that they were opposed to all war, and that if Rome had saved her gods, her gods would now have saved Rome. On the other hand, the Manicheans accused the Catholics of favouring war as such. In the course of his polemic with these opponents, a polemic which extended over many years, St. Augustine developed a whole system of doctrine on peace and war. And this system with very little further growth has been adopted and followed by the Church through all the intervening centuries.

One of the foremost Manicheans of the day, Faustus, published a work against the Old Testament, the main indictment of which was that these Scriptures glorified war. This was the Faustus, whom we meet in the *Confessions*, “a man of a very agreeable and sweet language, who did prate over the same things, which the others were wont to deliver, but much more delightfully, . . . furnished with an eloquence, which became the more agreeable and seductive by the application of his mother wit, together with a certain grace which to him was natural.”<sup>3</sup> In the Old Testament, Faustus urged, a whole series of wars and atrocities are presented as the work of God, inspired, directed, commanded by Him. What could be more abominable? As if God could be responsible for crime! And war is the greatest of crimes. Why were not the Catholics content with the Gospels? There all violence is forbidden, the forgiveness of injuries enjoined, the sword replaced by the Cross. We may note in passing that, as St. Augustine well knew, this attack on the Old Testament was but a preliminary to an assault on the Gospels themselves, which for the moment Faustus thus pretended to praise.

The Manichean is met by St. Augustine argument by argument, point by point. “What is the crime of war?

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 14.

<sup>3</sup> *Conf.*, v. 6.

Is it that men, who must die some day, are slain that others may live in peace? But this would be the objection of a coward, not of a Christian. It is the desire to ill-treat the enemy, cruel vengeance, an implacable heart, merciless reprisals, the lust of domination, and the like, these are the crime in war."<sup>4</sup> But these are evidently to be imputed to men only, not to war as such, and much less to God.

Faustus pretends to be scandalised that God should be represented as commanding Moses to wage war. St. Augustine goes to the root of the matter. God has imposed His eternal law upon all creation, and the observance of that law is order, is peace. But man introduces disorder, "when he loves things for their own sake that are to be used only for some other purpose, or when he desires for some other end that which should be loved for itself. Thus, as much as in him lies, he disturbs in himself that order of nature which the eternal law commands ever to be observed."<sup>5</sup> The world exists by equilibrium. When that harmony is destroyed, it must be restored. The restoration involves a painful operation, even at times those measures of correction and punishment which bear the name of war. Of whom the fault, the criminal or the judge? "In all that man's weakness fears and dreads, wickedness only is justly condemned; the rest is the tribute of nature, or the penalty of sin."<sup>6</sup>

And so God in commanding Moses to wage war "was not cruel, He was only treating men as they deserved. . . . It is for the punishment of excesses that war is undertaken by the just, at the command of God, or other lawful authority, and to this the right order of things compels them."<sup>7</sup> And St. Augustine goes on to argue that the human justice, or injustice of a particular war, is not to the point, for every war occurs at least by the permission of God "to subdue, or to destroy the pride of men," and to become for the elect an occasion "of exercising patience, practising humility and accepting correction from their Father's hand."<sup>8</sup>

It is foolish in Faustus to talk of opposition between

<sup>4</sup> *Contra Faustum*, xxii. 74.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii. 78.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

the Old and the New Testament. God does not change, nor the eternal order of things. Man alone can change. And it was to effect the necessary change in man that Christ devoted all His efforts. He set Himself to disarm the heart of man. Meanwhile, He did not attempt to disarm soldiers. He praised the faith of the Centurion, He did not call upon him to throw up his commission. Christ also commanded that tribute should be rendered to Cæsar, though that tribute would be spent on providing pay for the soldiers waging war. Our Lord lost no opportunity of recommending peace to men, but to secure peace charity and justice must reign in the hearts of men.

The whole teaching of the Gospels to this effect is brought out with even more force and fulness in a correspondence at a later date with his friend, the imperial officer, Marcellinus. Marcellinus places before the Bishop what were evidently current objections of the pagans of the day. They could not see how the Christian doctrine could be reconciled with the safety of the State, for instance to render to no man evil for evil, to turn the other cheek, to let go the cloak also to him who would take the tunic, and the like. "For who would suffer himself to be robbed by the enemy? Or who would not exact vengeance by the rights of war on anyone who should ravage a Roman province?" He begs for a clear and full solution, both for the sake of the Church in those difficult times, and also because the Bishop's own reputation was at stake. For one of the most prominent citizens of Hippo had happened to be present at the discussion, reported in this letter, and he, after words of ironic praise of Augustine, declared that he had submitted these same difficulties to him and had received no satisfaction.

In his reply, St. Augustine reminds his correspondent that the pagans themselves had appreciated and praised the forgiveness of private wrongs, quoting Cicero's encomium of Cæsar that he never forgot anything but injuries. He then proceeds to explain the teaching of Our Lord. The counsels of Christ "regard rather the inward disposition of the heart than the outward act; patience and goodwill must be nourished in the depths of the soul, but the external action should be such as we judge most beneficial for those to whom we wish only



well."<sup>10</sup> Thus Our Lord rebuked the man who struck Him upon the cheek,<sup>11</sup> to check him in his wickedness : and for the same reason St. Paul rebuked so unsparingly the High Priest who had ordered him to be struck upon the mouth.<sup>12</sup>

St. Augustine continues : " Our benevolence, or goodwill, must be so established in the soul as never to render evil for evil. Nevertheless there are many occasions, on which we must employ a loving harshness with those whose advantage we are to consider rather than their pleasure. . . . For however sternly a father may correct his son, he does not therefore put aside his fatherly affection. However reluctantly he inflicts pain that by that pain the sufferer may be healed."<sup>13</sup> So is God compared with a loving father who himself feels pain at the suffering which he inflicts. God must bring back order into the great human family to save it from dishonour, decadence and ruin. " When He overthrows that which supports vice and deprives men of the means of satisfying their passions, then it is in mercy that God afflicts us."<sup>14</sup> A strange fashion of showing pity to allow multitudes of human beings to suffer, grieve and perish? Would it be better to permit them to sin with impunity? In such case indeed His anger is far more severe, His punishment more terrible, *indignatur gravior*, . . . *punitur infestius*. Then a nation loses, not its blood, but its soul. Nothing is more dreadful than the prosperity of the wicked.

Unjustly therefore is the Christian Church accused of blind pacifism. Assuredly she does her utmost to secure concord between the nations; but when wars occur she recognises in them the just judgments of God; and in accordance with the divine designs, " wars should be waged by the good even with compassion, if possible, by the repression of lust to destroy those vices, which it was the duty of a righteous government to extirpate or subdue."<sup>15</sup>

In writing against Faustus, St. Augustine had declared that the seeds of war are to be sought in the human heart. In the *De Civitate Dei* he works out this theory in detail

<sup>10</sup> *Epist.*, 138.

<sup>11</sup> *John*, xviii. 23.

<sup>12</sup> *Acts*, xxiii. 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

and furnishes instances from sacred and profane history, and especially from the story of the Roman Empire. He finds the cause of war to be threefold : political, economic and moral, and as he proceeds in his masterly analysis, he seems almost to be examining the conscience of our own times.

The first political cause is a mania for conquest. As with individuals, so with nations, the lust to extend boundaries at the neighbour's expense grew in its gratification from fever to something approaching insanity. " Apart from justice, what are kingdoms but brigand's booty on a large scale? . . . When Alexander demanded of a captured pirate what right he had to infest the sea, with a bold insolence he replied : ' The same as thou to infest the world ; but because I do it with one small ship I am called a robber, and thou, with a large fleet, Emperor.' " <sup>16</sup> So with the Romans, when they vindicated their own liberty, liberty seemed a small thing, once their ambition was aroused, unless they could dominate the whole world. And this lust won from their own writers and poets only admiration and praise. <sup>17</sup>

Another prolific political cause of war is the excessive exaltation of the sentiment of nationality. There are peoples who regard themselves as the predestined masters of mankind ; their race, their laws, their virtues, their civilization are of such super-excellence that the only reasonable attitude for all others is to admire and render homage. Hence a sensitive jealousy, ever ready to take offence and exact vengeance. In a beautiful passage St. Augustine observes that neighbouring States should live as peaceably together as homesteads side by side in the same city. " And an evil mind it is that desires to have enemies to hate and foes to fear in order to have countries to conquer. " <sup>18</sup>

A third political cause of war is the deliberate attempt of governments to find in it a safe outlet for the turbulent elements of the people, to check growing degeneracy, or to forestall civil discord. After the destruction of Carthage such a flood of moral evil rolled over Rome that its very security and prosperity became the greatest menace to the State, and " Carthage in its sudden fall

<sup>16</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, iv. 4.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 12.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, iv. 15.

was proved to work more mischief than before in all its long sustained resistance."<sup>19</sup>

A final fruitful political cause of war, the personal ambition of the ruler. St. Augustine instances Cæsar, of whom Sallust admiringly relates that "he desired for himself great power, an army and a new war, that he might be able to show what he was worth. And so," adds the Saint, "it was the dearest wish of these great men that wretched nations should be driven to war, and Bellona wield her bloody scourge to give them an occasion to prove their valour. This was the effect of their avidity for fame and their lust for glory."<sup>20</sup>

The economic causes can be reduced to an inordinate love of material goods. These things have their worth, but in the scale of values wealth holds the lowest place. However, unhappily, virtue is esteemed less than possessions, the equilibrium of life is broken, peace is menaced, and war ensues. "The city of the world also has its *summum bonum* . . . but such that for the most part this city is divided against itself, in lawsuits, and wars, and strifes, and the pursuit of victories which in themselves are fatal, or at least fated to perish."<sup>21</sup> And again: "The society of men scattered throughout the world, in countries the most diverse, is nevertheless bound together in the union of one and the same nature. Everyone seeks his own advantage and the satisfaction of his desires, and since finally nobody is satisfied in this pursuit, usually the race is divided against itself and the powerful oppress the weak."<sup>22</sup>

What need to dwell upon the moral causes of war? The political and economic sources already analysed by Augustine derive their entire strength from the moral corruption of the heart of man. This is a theme to which indeed the Saint often returns. "Men have a horror of war and long for peace. And who would not? But while all hate war and desire peace, even the just man has but to turn his eyes upon himself and there he finds war. You ask me what war. *Blessed the man whom Thou shalt teach, O Lord, and instruct from Thy law.* Here is a man who asks me what war the just man endures in

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 21.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 12.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, xv. 4.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii. 2.

himself. Teach him from Thy law. Let Thy Apostle speak: *The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh.*<sup>23</sup> And where shall I cast my flesh, if the trumpet sounds for war, and, which God forbid, the enemy rush upon me? Man flees and he takes his war with him whithersoever he goeth. I do not say, if he be an evil man; precisely, if he is good, if he is living righteously, he understands what the Apostle says: *The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh.*"<sup>24</sup> And again: "For certainly, though the passions be subdued, never are they overcome without conflict. And assuredly in this abode of our weakness, even when a man is fighting bravely, or has such enemies mastered and subject, something is constantly occurring whereby sin is committed, if not by some hasty action, at least by a slip of the tongue or a passing thought. And so, while the passions are kept under, there is yet no full peace, because some still rebel and the issue is doubtful, and those that are mastered leave no space for the security of a triumphant leisure, but they remain subject only at the cost of watchful suppression."<sup>25</sup>

But St. Augustine acknowledges that there can be just wars; wars, that is, that are just on the one side because of the injustice of the other party. And this question of what constitutes a just war, which is obviously pivotal in the whole discussion, he has treated with characteristic care and thoroughness.

And first evidently a war of defence is legitimate. The individual has the right to repel violence by violence, a right conceded by the law of nature itself.<sup>26</sup> With much greater reason must this right be conceded to the State. St. Augustine quotes Cicero to this effect: "I know that in Cicero's third book *de Republica*, if I remember aright, it is held that a rightly constituted city does not undertake war, except for its given word, or its safety. In another place he shows what he understands by this safety, saying . . . No death is natural for the State as it is for the individual, for whom it is not only inevitable but often even desirable. For a State to cease, to be suppressed, to be destroyed, is, to compare small things with

<sup>23</sup> *Gal.*, v. 17.

<sup>24</sup> *Ser.*, xxv. 4.

<sup>25</sup> *De Civ Dei*, xix. 27.

<sup>26</sup> *De libero arbitrio*, v. 11.

great, as if the whole world were to perish and to fall into ruins."<sup>27</sup> And the Saint agrees that in the beginning at least Rome was justified in some of her wars by the need of self-protection: "It is a just defence of the Romans that it was not the lust of gaining earthly renown, but the necessity of safeguarding their wellbeing and freedom that forced them into so many wars against the foes that assailed them."<sup>28</sup>

But the question of an offensive war is much more delicate. The need of repelling an attack leaves no time for deliberation; but before launching an attack motives, reasons, opportunity, consequences are to be weighed with the greatest caution and prudence. "The just man will wage only a just war."<sup>29</sup> But how is a just war to be recognised? In this only that it avenges a wrong inflicted. "*Justa autem bella definiri solent, quae ulciscuntur injurias.*"<sup>30</sup> And he goes on to specify what such wrongs would be: "When the nation, or city, which is to be threatened with war either refuses to punish an injury wrought by its citizens or to restore that which has been wrongfully taken away."<sup>31</sup> Even so, the good will enter upon war with the greatest reluctance, willing to make any possible sacrifice for the sake of peace, eager to treat, to compromise. "To wage war and by conquest to extend dominion appears to the wicked a happy chance, to the good a sad necessity. But since it would be worse for the unjust aggressors to oppress the inoffensive, only in that sense can war be considered good. But beyond all doubt it is better to have peace with a good neighbour than by fighting to subdue a bad neighbour."<sup>32</sup> And he goes on to remark that it was in fact the unjust aggression of the enemies of Rome which contributed largely to the growth of the Empire. For thus it was that "just wars were waged and the power of Rome increased."<sup>33</sup>

Elsewhere St. Augustine mentions another legitimate reason for war, which might not appear at first sight to be covered by the definition given above. Referring to

<sup>27</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 6.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 10.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, xix. 7.

<sup>30</sup> *Quaest. in Hept.*, vi. 10.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, iv. 15.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

the conquest of the Amorrhites by the chosen people, he writes: "Observe how just wars were then waged. They had been denied a peaceful passage, which ought to have been permitted them by the common law of equity of the human race."<sup>34</sup> Here indeed he touches upon the *jus gentium*, the law of nations, not even yet fully declared, or codified. Probably the times were never more propitious for the authoritative exposition of this law of nature in principle and in detail than the present. Perhaps the Vatican Council, when it reassembles, will settle this question also for the guidance of the faithful and the world.

With whom rests the right, on whom lies the tremendous responsibility of declaring war? St. Augustine answers simply, the Prince. "It is of the utmost importance to define for what reasons and on what authority men should undertake to wage war. The order of nature ordained for the peace of mortals demands that the decision and authority for commencing war should rest with the Prince."<sup>35</sup> Evidently here the Prince is just the supreme ruler in the State. But what single ruler can be trusted to be unbiassed in a decision of such intense personal and national interest, and at the same time of such immeasurable import to the whole world? It is not astonishing that theologians and statesmen and peoples are looking for an international, shall we not rather say a supranational authority to undertake this responsibility for the sake of both justice and peace. And Catholics are not alone in recognizing that such an authority is already provided for the nations in the Holy See.

Once war has opened, St. Augustine looks to the soldier to obey orders. Evidently he does not expect him to be competent to form a judgment on the justice of the conflict. "The soldiers must give their service to carry out the orders of their military chief for the sake of the common peace and welfare."<sup>36</sup> The soldier is to have no fear that in shedding blood he is committing sin, provided always that he does so only in the course of his duty. "When a soldier in obedience to his lawful superiors slays a man, no law of the State regards him as a homicide; rather if he does not do so he is guilty of

<sup>34</sup> *Quaest. in Hept.*, iv. 44.

<sup>35</sup> *Contra Faustum*, xxii. 75.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*



disobedience and contempt. But if he had slain a man by his own will and authority, he would have been guilty of the crime of bloodshed."<sup>37</sup> And this obedience the Christian soldier must pay even, say, to a pagan, or apostate prince, when called upon to fight in the interests of peace, provided that the orders are not evidently sinful; for the authority of such a prince is still from God.<sup>38</sup>

For the rest the soldier is to remember that he is a Christian no less in war than in peace. St. Augustine attributes the early victories of the Romans against overwhelming odds to the frugality and moral discipline that then distinguished their lives.<sup>39</sup> And later he quotes Sallust to the effect that the decadence of the Empire commenced when the Roman soldier gave himself to debauchery and luxury.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, in a letter to his beloved Boniface then on active service, he draws a picture of what the Christian soldier should be: "Let your conduct be distinguished by conjugal modesty, sobriety and frugality; for it would be disgraceful that one who remains unconquered by the enemy should succumb to lust, that one who has not been overthrown by the sword should be vanquished by wine."<sup>41</sup>

Above all, he cannot endure that the soldier should enter light-heartedly upon war as if it were a fête. "The will should be utterly for peace, war a dire necessity, that God may deliver from this necessity and keep us in peace. For peace is not sought that war may be raised again, but war is waged that peace may be acquired. Even in war, then, be a man of peace, that by overcoming those against whom you are fighting you may bring them the blessing of peace. *Blessed are the peace-makers, saith the Lord, for they shall be called the children of God.* . . . Let it not be your will, but necessity, that urges you to strike down the foe."<sup>42</sup>

In war faith is to be kept with the enemy, much more with allies. Christians may lose battles, they must never lose their honour. "Once your word is given, it must be kept, even with the enemy against whom you are wag-

<sup>37</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, i. 26.

<sup>38</sup> *Contra Faustum*, xxii. 75.

<sup>39</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, v. 12.

<sup>40</sup> *Epist.*, 138, 16.

<sup>41</sup> *Epist.*, 189, 7.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

ing war; how much more with the ally, for whom you are fighting."<sup>43</sup> In the quotation from the *de Republica* given above, Cicero assigns as one of the just reasons for war a city's pledged word. With deep emotion and manifest admiration, Augustine recalls the destruction of Sagunto, sacrificed in fidelity to the alliance it had made with Rome. "In all the disasters of the second Punic war there is nothing more tragic, more worthy of pity, than the ruin of Sagunto. This city of Spain, closely knit in friendship with Rome, was overthrown for the keeping of its given word. Hannibal, violating his treaty with the Romans, laid siege to Sagunto. . . . And in the eighth or ninth month the wretched city, formerly so opulent and so dear to its own nation and to Rome, was destroyed. The details are almost too ferrible to read, much more to write. . . . First it was wasted with famine; it is even said that dead bodies were devoured. At length, when utterly worn down, that nothing might be left to fall into the hands of the enemy, an immense pyre was built, and having put all the others to the sword, the soldiers threw the bodies and finally themselves into the flames. . . . There is the instance also of Regulus. But he was only one man, this was a whole city. However, in both cases death was preferred to a breach of faith."<sup>44</sup>

Again, in the fighting the inevitable miseries of war are to be reduced to the minimum. Augustine recalls with horror the commonplaces of warfare as accepted both in theory and practice by the pagan world. "Lads and maidens are carried off, infants torn from the arms of their mothers, matrons handed over to the whim of the victors, temples and dwellings sacked, razed, burned; on every side slaughter, and corpses, and blood, and grief."<sup>45</sup> "Innumerable tragedies, dire destruction, if I were to attempt to give an adequate description, my effort would be foredoomed to failure, and I could never make an end."<sup>46</sup> With all this he is happy to be able to contrast the conduct of the Christian Emperor, Theodosius: "The children of his enemies, whom the war had orphaned. . . . he loved with a Christian charity; far from depriving them of their property, he loaded them with favours. He

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, iii. 20.

<sup>45</sup> (*Sallust. de Conjuratone Catalinae.*) *Ibid.*, i. 5.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, xix. 7.

suffered no one to take advantage of the victory to satisfy private vengeance."<sup>47</sup> To the same effect he instances the unwonted clemency of the barbarians who had spared such as took refuge in the Christian churches: "Whatever there was of destruction, slaughter, looting, burning, misery, in that recent sacking of Rome, all this was in accord with the custom of war. But what was utterly new and without precedent was the softening of the barbarian brutality to permit the very largest basilicas to be chosen and set apart and filled with refugees, brought thither in many instances by the enemy themselves, as asylums where nobody should be injured, and whence not one should be taken or made captive. And he who does not see that this is due to the name of Christ and to the Christian era is blind indeed."<sup>48</sup>

Finally, from the moment of decisive victory all hostilities should cease. The instinct of nature itself has always driven nations to accept the most stringent terms rather than face utter destruction in a ruthless war. "The vanquished submit to the victor, to his dominion, that is, preferring any kind of peace and wellbeing even to freedom. For in almost every people the voice of nature has made itself heard that being conquered they should submit rather than be annihilated by fighting to the end."<sup>49</sup> After all, the only end of war is peace. "There is no one that does not long for peace. Even those that welcome war aim only at victory; that is, they desire by war to attain to a glorious peace. For what is victory, but the subjection of those that resist? When this is attained there will be peace. War therefore is waged for the sake of peace even by those who look to exercise their warlike qualities in strategy and conflict. So it is clear that the one end desired in war is peace."<sup>50</sup> Accordingly: "As the foe must be repelled with force, so the vanquished and the captive have every right to compassion, above all when clemency will not compromise the interests of peace."<sup>51</sup> And in another beautiful letter to the same Count Boniface, the whole duty of leader and soldier alike is summed up in the saying: "Stand by your word; seek peace."<sup>52</sup>

x In victory the Christian State should be careful not to abuse its triumph. There is always the danger of apply-

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 26. <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 7. <sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii. 2. <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, xix. 12.

<sup>51</sup> *Epist.*, 189, 6. <sup>52</sup> *Epist.*, 220, 12.

ing to peace the methods of war and of turning conquest into oppression. In his regret for the tyrannical system of the Roman Empire towards subject races, in his desire that all should have been admitted to the full privileges of Roman citizenship, Augustine has words of wisdom for a world-power in any age.<sup>53</sup> "It is fatal for the victorious city to exult in its conquest. . . . For it will not always be able to hold in subjection those whom its present triumph has subdued."<sup>54</sup> "For what advantage it is to wellbeing and good morals—the real dignity of men—to keep up the distinction between victors and vanquished, I utterly fail to see."<sup>55</sup>

And constantly he returns to the theme that the loss of peace, the recurrence of war can always be traced back to the same source, the unrestrained passions of the human heart. "The wicked fight with the wicked; so also the wicked fight with the good. But the good with the good, these could never fight, if they were perfect."<sup>56</sup>

Meanwhile, with the barbarian invasion of the Empire, war is at his very door. Incessantly the aged Bishop prays for peace. Eagerly he welcomes any hope, any possibility of negotiations for a truce. He hears that Darius has been sent from the Imperial Court at Ravenna into Africa to treat for the cessation of hostilities. It is a few months before his death, and he writes him a most touching letter of congratulation, a fitting and glorious conclusion to his life-long labours in the sacred cause of Peace.

"*Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God.* Our fighting men are great and they have their glory, not only the valiant, but just those also who are faithful to their duty, and this indeed is higher praise. With the help of God's protection and favour, they face toil and danger to subdue an obstinate enemy and to restore tranquillity to the State and peace to the provinces. But it is a greater glory to slay war itself by speech than men by the sword, and to attain or win peace by peace, and not by war. For those also that fight, if they are good, undoubtedly aim only at peace, but they strive after it through blood. It is your mission to secure that no man's blood be spilt. On them therefore lies that necessary; to you falls this happiness."

<sup>53</sup> *De Civ. Dei*, v. 17. <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, xv. 4. <sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 17. <sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, xv. 5.

## THE PRIEST'S LIFE IN ITS ENVIRONMENT TO-DAY

### III. OUR DAILY FOOD.

BY X. MARCEL BOULESTIN.

**W**E write articles and we write books and we publish recipes which we try to make as attractive and as simple as possible. The dishes, thus described, being made in a natural and normal way with good materials, are nourishing and healthy; they should stimulate our appetite and do no harm to our digestion, the only rule being to avoid things which do not agree with our system.

And now we see, in an almost blinding light, the fundamental difference between the French and the English. For the British Government have (some time ago) announced the appointment of a Committee to advise the public on matters of nutrition: "the duty of the Committee will be to translate into plain language scientific knowledge of the value of food." A fact significant in itself.

Just as significant as the American menus, where next to the name of the dish is printed the number of calories the dish contains, this being calculated by a "food expert" who, of course, never bothers about the culinary quality of the dish.

Some people will say (indeed, have said): "Ah, but the French are different; they are healthy, have a better digestion and can manage to eat better food; that is, food richer and more varied, than the English; the Frenchman knows nothing of the anxiety that gnaws at the minds of those whose less nourishing, less balanced diet keeps them always wondering whether they dare risk this dish or that drink"—which may be true.

But the point is that the French have that "superior digestive power" precisely because of their old-fashioned and natural diet. A little common-sense and pleasant food are all that is required; the health-giving qualities will follow naturally, will be the result of the better food, eaten with more pleasure.

We never hear in France all these sermons on vitamins, calories, and the like, because the French people of all classes eat as a matter of course this or that food which they grow or buy. They do this instinctively, like a cat who, feeling out of sorts, eats a blade of grass in the garden. Teaching dietetic value is a poor inducement to eat, and it is treating a pleasant and normal function as if it were an acquired habit or disease.

There is no doubt about it; good meals should be the rule, not the exception. And we must think of cooking not as cooking of this or that country, or cooking from the health point of view, or cooking as an artistic occupation—just cooking in relation to our daily life. There, like everywhere else, the “good enough” attitude is a silly one and leads nowhere. We must try to improve our daily food, and moreover take an interest in it. For the work in which we take no interest is not worth doing.

Good meals need not be expensive, and it is a great mistake to believe that it is indispensable to spend lots of money if you want to live well. In French cooking, for instance, nothing is wasted and a large number of quite delicious dishes are made of “remnants” thereby saving the purchase of another “joint,” half of which, inevitably, would be wasted or face you, cold and dull, till you were sick of it.

By spending “lots of money” I mean spending something like thirty shillings a head a week. Yet I understand from many people that they spend quite that and sometimes even more, though their fare is of the plainest—which must be due to bad ordering, careless management, indifference, and therefore waste. I am afraid the average English cook is by nature extravagant; she likes ordering things by large amounts; if for a dish she wants a little cream, she will probably order half a pint, and half of it, unused, will go bad. If, instead of trying to check this natural, this national propensity you remain aloof, what can you expect? Can you expect a servant to “bother” if you do not? And what is the use afterwards of complaining about it to your friends and of sighing over your enormous “books”? A little more knowledge of what Meredith calls “the conduct of the kitchen” would be far more to the point.



The first, the main thing to do is to eliminate waste. No one, these days, can afford to waste materials, for materials are always more or less costly. Even if money did not count waste is stupid and wicked. It is immoral. But most people waste perfectly good things, not out of wickedness, but simply because they do not care; they do not realize the value and the sport of economy. For it becomes an amazing sport to make things do, to "manage" this week on less than you did the week before. And what a triumph if we can at the same time reduce the household bills and enjoy the results of this measure; we have then the double satisfaction of having done our duty, and well deserved our happiness. A great peace is upon us and the active feeling of pleasure becomes distinct from the passive feeling of accomplished duty. The moment you realize this, the moment your cook appreciates this (for her) new point of view, no doubt she will willingly and proudly enter into the spirit of the game. But this will not occur to her until you tell her, smilingly but firmly, that it is better for everybody concerned to economize than to waste. After all, it is not her money; she may have been with you only a short time, she is only human. . . .

People with a large staff, lots of money and a good cook do not have, as a rule, to solve these daily problems. Still, even the employer in an expensive establishment may not get out of the cook all that is possible, any more than the person who has a quite ordinary servant. If I may say so, it is usually the fault of both. In thousands of homes it is the same story. The housekeeper gets indifferent food because she herself knows nothing about cooking and probably despises it; perhaps she also despises the cook, but cannot do without her. The cook in turn despises her for her ignorance; she remains bad because neither of them take any interest. Result: neither can improve.

If we agree that food is important in life we must admit that a cook is an important person in the household. She lurks in her kitchen, out of which appear trays, dishes; smells escape, together with noises. It is her castle, and does anyone dare enter? That aloofness has its drawbacks. Is she ever spoken to, I mean like a real person? No, I am afraid that too many people are inclined to treat a worthy person in an unworthy

way, to think of a cook just as a servant performing tedious domestic duties, which is very wrong and asking, in fact, for disaster. Can we reasonably expect her to take an interest in her work, if we do not take any ourselves? The rich and the poor have their duties as well as the cook, which they must perform.

After all, it is not very difficult, all that is required of the housekeeper is a little knowledge, common-sense and understanding. By which I do not mean understanding of the technicalities of cooking, but simply understanding of human nature. The relations between the employer and the housekeeper must be human. If the two parties are both on the defensive the result is bound to be unpleasant: which means bad temper and indigestion.

Another duty, the most important of all, is to show appreciation. It is only fair, when the cook has taken trouble over a specially nice dish to give her the praise that she deserves, that she has the right to expect; it is equally necessary to mention lightly but firmly what was wrong with that other dish; but this should be done kindly and, above all, do not be discouraging and sarcastic about the failure. Yet the cook must know that you know; the dish must be made correctly the next time, and, above all, she must not get away with the illusion that her mistake was not noticed. Indeed, by saying nothing, the housekeeper or the employer would go down in the cook's estimation, which would lead, sooner or later, to dull and careless meals.

Pleased by compliments, appreciative of just criticism, interested in her work, eager to try new things, our perfect cook sees, so to speak, eye to eye with her perfect housekeeper, who realizes that the interest taken in the dining-room is bound to have a good influence on the kitchen. The cook, stimulated, will take more pains and achieve better results. She will feel that she is not only a hired servant, but that she is in fact part of the household, a human being with her qualities and her failings like all of us, and treated as such.

On the other hand, the cook must also play the game. We expect from her good food. If she is not as good as she should be, she must be willing to learn and not be on the defensive about criticism or new dishes. We also expect from her interest, initiative, honesty, an even

temper, in fact all the qualities which make our lives, as well as her own, pleasant.

Speaking as a Frenchman I would personally expect from her less aloofness. She ought not to think so much of the kitchen as "her" kitchen. It is not so in France, where the relations are, shall I say, more friendly. There the human touch adds interest to the relationship. And it is that human element which is necessary to the good work, to the better result, because it makes the work nobler and more dignified, because it gives a kind of moral quality to a "job" which otherwise can be nothing but tedious drudgery.

This applies not only to rich people with cooks and kitchen maids, not only to people with only one servant, not only to cooks, but even more so to the woman who looks after somebody's small house. It is specially to her that I preach interest in her work, pride in the results. They may be poor and sometimes hard up; well, she must try to manage that week on even less than the week before, to keep up the standard, to use everything, to do her utmost and she must do it not with resignation, that is the wrong attitude in life; she must take pleasure in her fight in the same way that she must take personal satisfaction in the performance of her domestic duties.

I have already stated that in French cooking, nothing is really wasted. I shall explain further how a perfectly good meal can be made with a few scraps; in fact, out of nothing.

My story begins in the country on a Monday afternoon of last spring, when all roads were like sheets of ice. Going back to London was out of question; going to the next small town rather risky; so we decided to make up a dinner out of what was left in the week-end cottage. The larder in a week-end cottage fifty miles from Town, and six miles from a provincial town with good shops is not usually very full. This time it was quite empty, as according to my French ideas of "no waste," almost everything had been used up for Monday luncheon, according to plan, since we were going back to London for dinner.

So there was in the larder not quite half a roast chicken, a few carrots, three mushrooms, one tomato, one rasher

of bacon, two eggs, a little butter, a cup of milk and the outside leaves of six curly chicory—and, of course, the usual onions, potatoes, garlic, herbs and spices, which are almost part of the kitchen furniture.

With all these we made a very pleasant dinner for three people, a dinner which satisfied our hunger, pleased our palates, and, morally, our minds.

It will be noticed that six salads have been used during the week-end. Personally, I would have a salad at every meal. We are told by people that they are good for one's health. This would be poor inducement to our eating salads if they were not so pleasant and useful. In fact, it turned out that our best dish was the *purée* made of the outside salad leaves—a dish which I really recommend. And I recommend making it with the outside leaves, keeping the tender hearts to be eaten raw (that is where the thrifty French nature comes out), because outside leaves are just as good cooked as the heart; and if you are preparing that dish with the hearts only, as, in cooking, salad reduces enormously, it will be very expensive (since, unfortunately, salad in England is a luxury article often imported from abroad at great cost).

The soup was simply and quickly made with the bones, carcasses and trimmings of the chicken, put in cold salted water with a bouquet of thyme, bayleaf, and parsley; a little later the carrots cut in slices, the tomato, and one onion, cut in quarters, were added. The soup, brought to the boil, was allowed to simmer and to reduce for half an hour or so.

Then the carrots were removed and put aside for the fricassée of chicken. The soup was passed through a strainer, the seasoning was corrected, a tablespoonful of French tapioca thrown in, and the soup was cooked ten minutes more. Just before serving, a liaison of yolk of egg diluted in a little milk.

The fricassée was made with whatever flesh was left on the chicken, cut in small pieces, and tossed in the fat resulting from the preliminary frying of the rasher of bacon with a little butter added, paprika, and spices, just one minute over the fire. A little flour was then sprinkled over it and cooked for one minute, a cupful of the soup (before the tapioca was put in), the pieces of carrot, the bacon cut in pieces, and the mushrooms

previously partly cooked. Twenty minutes later, after slow cooking, the dish was ready with a very good thickish sauce of the velouté kind. We had sauté potatoes with this.

As for the *purée de chicorée*, the leaves were well cleaned (bruised parts removed), revived for ten minutes in cold water, then well drained, put into a large saucepan with salt. A kettleful of boiling water was poured over them and they were cooked quickly till tender. They were then drained, squashed through a sieve, well seasoned with salt and pepper; butter and milk were added and well mixed, two minutes over the fire, during which time croûtons were fried. And there was a perfect dish for next to nothing. Lettuce can be treated in the same way, and you can serve over it if you prefer instead of croûtons, eggs poached or fried. A little cream instead of milk is, of course, better.

Now this is only an example of what can be done with a little ingenuity and a sound knowledge of cooking: any amount of dishes can be prepared in the same manner, including all these superb *maigre* vegetable soups for which no meat or stock is required. (Indeed, to prepare them with stock instead of water would spoil them and destroy their specific character.) There are all the dishes made out of "remnants." No, French cooking is the most economical of all and one need not have elaborate dishes, if one does not want to; the point is that you can make out of boiled beef or cold mutton many dishes which are delicious and cost almost nothing. But French cooking done wrongly is expensive: for instance, your *consommé* will cost you a great deal if you do not make good use of the beef which is necessary for its goodness.

The utilization of "remnants" need not be tasteless and monotonous. It is obvious that anybody, however easily satisfied, will become very tired of boiled beef and cold mutton done up as a watery hash or a floury stew; but beef au gratin, salad of beef, hachis Parmentier, emincés of mutton, to quote only a few, are very good dishes one would choose to have, even if it was not a question of utilizing the things left over.

Needless to say, when eggs, for instance, are cheap, one can vary the menu more by having egg dishes; some quite common fish is also delicious if properly prepared.

It is, also, in the summer, more economical still to have a fairly large cold meat to last a few days.

Ah, what better luncheon on a summer day than an omelette, cold chicken or a well-spiced home-made galantine, a lettuce salad flavoured with *fines herbes* and spring onions and a cream cheese? It has the excellence of simplicity, and I like to think that the eggs come from our hens, the salad and the herbs from our garden, and, of course, we have made the vinegar ourselves—as it should be in every perfect household.

Simplicity, in fact, should be the *mot-d'ordre*; and elaborate dishes should appear only on special festive occasions. Yet that elaborateness should be of the right kind. Pretentiousness should be avoided: it is conducive to badness.

The ordinary cook, forgetting that simplicity is the secret (and, in fact, the *raison d'être*) of good cooking, often goes wildly astray over galantines, mousses de jambon and salads, which she purposely complicates in the worst American fashion. And she thinks she has reached the heights when she has so disguised a cold chicken, that it neither looks nor tastes like one, drowned, as it were, in stiff jelly which is pure gelatine, and overdressed with a white sauce whose sole flavour is that of flour, unless it is of office paste. Only then, when she has made the dinner table look like a buffet at some fifth-rate fancy dress ball, does she depart for an evening out, with the proud feeling that she has done her duty. Pretentiousness, daintiness and coarseness are the pitfalls to be avoided.

There is one more thing I should like to emphasize. It is not necessary in order to cook well, and to make all sorts of dishes to have a large kitchen with a thousand pans, and elaborate gadgets.

Art and science do not always walk, so to speak, hand in hand; and it does not follow that because one is the proud owner of a kitchen "with every modern improvement," as house agents say, one is certain to have perfect cooking. Nothing less certain; in fact, in order to enjoy really perfect cooking, one has to forget these famous modern improvements and go back to cooking as it was done hundreds of years ago. It is indeed remarkable that science has done nothing for cooking—except spoil



it; by which I do not allude only to the fateful substitutes, essences, creams, sauces and other non-descript concoctions, but also to the means of cooking.

No oven, either heated by coals, gas or electricity, will compare with an open fire for the roasting, on a spit, of meat or birds; and when baking is the process required, the old-fashioned baker's oven made of bricks and heated by wood is ten times better than the average range oven. As for grilling, those who have not tasted a chop or steak cooked on charcoals, well "seized" and enclosing all the juices and the complete flavour between its almost burnt sides, do not even begin to realize what grilling can be.

However, since very few people can afford the luxury of roasting on a spit, and fewer still bother to have meat grilled on charcoals, in spite of the fact that this, at least, is a very simple affair, we must be satisfied with an ordinary kitchen. First of all, that kitchen must not be large; a small one is less tiring to work in, as you can actually put your hand on anything you want without walking round a table or running to a dresser. In fact, you ought to be able, without moving, to take things from the table to the range.

The range must be one to which you can soon become accustomed. A coal range is still, without any doubt, the best to use, but this, of course, is not always possible. The best kind of gas cooker is the one with a covered-in top forming a hot-plate; but by careful manipulation of the jets one can get quite good results on an ordinary gas stove.

If possible the sink should not be too far away, as much time and energy is saved if you wash things as soon as they are finished with, under the hot water tap; wash up as you go on should be the rule in every small establishment. And, in the case of dirty saucepans, if they are at once filled with hot water (with a piece of soda), they will not take nearly so much time or give so much trouble when the real washing up time comes.

As for utensils, a few saucepans and sauteuses of different sizes, two frying pans (one being kept for omelette), a cocotte or two (either cast iron or earthenware), two strainers, a sieve, two whips (one being kept for whites of eggs), a few bowls and really sharp knives are about all that are required, besides the usual tins,

wooden spoons and the deep frying affair with a wire basket. Practically any dinner can be prepared easily with these few utensils.

But when I say "usual tins" I do not mean tins containing food, for "tinned goods" are really another form of waste: even when cheap they are expensive, since they contain neither the nutritious qualities nor the calories or vitamins (or whatever these scientific virtues are) which fresh foods possess. If at a certain time of year there are only one or two fruits you can use pleasantly in a fruit salad, you must be satisfied with that; if there are no suitable fruits at all—well, have something else, a compôte or marmalade of cooked fruit which can be equally delicious if well prepared and properly served.

If peas, or French beans are not "in" why should you expect any? Ah! let us be wise and have the ripe things at the right time. Let us have the things that are in season. What pleasure is there in eating out of season expensive products artificially grown? What taste in them, what satisfaction? And what delight shall we have when they come to us in their time, so to speak, as a gift from Nature, if we eat them all the year round?

We must be humble and thankful for what we have got. But of what we have got let us make the best use. It should be our pleasurable duty.

## HOMILETICS

BY THE RT. REV. MGR. DEAN, D.D., Ph.D.

*Fourth Sunday of Lent.*

*Epistle.* (Galatians iv. 22-31.)

*Lætare Sunday.* Rejoice?—and Calvary in sight! Yea, *lætare Jerusalem* cries the Introit; *lætare sterilis* echoes the epistle; *lætatus sum* answers the Gradual. Why? Because “redemption is at hand.” Presently God will die that men “may have life and have it abundantly.” With His death the Old Covenant shall cease and the New shall be inaugurated. “It is finished” shall ring out on Calvary, “for Christ is the consummation of the Law,” marking at once its cessation and its fulfilment. He will fulfil the moral law by bringing it to perfection; the prophets by accomplishing their predictions; the rule of faith by bequeathing the fulness of revelation; the ceremonial law by substituting “grace and truth” for the signs and shadows thereof; the whole scheme of redemption by the establishment of “the Kingdom of God” upon earth.

Such is the lesson of to-day’s epistle; such the cause of our rejoicing. A new era is about to dawn. The imperfect is to yield to the perfect, “the shadow of things heavenly” to “their reality.” For the inferior priesthood of Levi there cometh “the more excellent” priesthood of Christ; for the ceaseless slaying of animals—the one and perfect unbloody sacrifice of the Son of God; for the manna of the wilderness—the true bread of heaven; behold, a Real Presence in lieu of an empty temple; life-giving sacraments in place of dead rites, the liberty of the Law of Christ for the fetters of the Law of Moses, the grace of sonship for the servitude of sin.

The words with which St. Paul brings home these grand truths have long proved a stumbling-block to many. Yet the principle of interpretation is familiar to all: that the divine Author of Holy Writ excels all human authors in this—that He alone can intend and use the persons, events, and things whereof He writes to signify other persons, events, and things of history yet to come. That such power belongs only to the divine Author is clear from the fact that He alone by His providence controls the course of history, and so He alone can bring it about that, in due time and with due resemblance to type, the things that were prefigured shall ever come to be. It is equally clear that, before we assert the presence of type and anti-type, we must be assured of God’s original intention to make the earlier event recorded signify the later. Thus we have the assurance of the inspired evangelist (John xix. 36), that the paschal lamb prefigured “the Lamb of God”—Jesus; of St. Paul (Rom. v. 14).

that the first Adam typified Christ; of 1 Peter iii. 21, that in the ark of Noah we have an allegory or type of Christian baptism. So, likewise, in to-day's epistle we have the word of the inspired apostle that Abraham's two wives, Hagar the bond-woman and Sarah the free-woman, are types of the Old and New Covenants with their respective characteristics.

St. Paul appeals to the Law itself against those wrong-headed Jews who, still cherishing "the copies of the heavenly realities," were urging the observance of the Mosaic Law as an integral part of the Gospel of Christ: *It is written*, in Genesis xvi.-xxi., *that Abraham had two sons, one—Ishmael—by the slave Hagar, and one—Isaac—by the free-woman Sarah.* As the status of the mother determined the status of the offspring, Ishmael was born into bondage, Isaac—a freeman. But furthermore, Ishmael, *the one by the slave was begotten according to the flesh*, naturally, in the ordinary course of nature; while Isaac, *the one by the free*, was begotten contrary to the course of nature—for Sarah was aged and barren—in virtue of a promise made by God and by Him wonderfully fulfilled. Thus it is clear from the outset that, though both the sons were carnal descendants of Abraham, and both born with God's approval (even as the Mosaic and Christian Dispensations are both of divine institution), Isaac alone was divinely predestined to be the recipient of special favours and privileges. Hence the apostle continues: *Now these things befell in allegory*, prefiguring greater things. *For these women*, Hagar and Sarah, *are types and representatives of the two Covenants; the Old, the one from Mount Sinai, its birth-place, bringing forth children into bondage,—which is Hagar.* Her slave-condition alone sufficiently determines the character of the covenant which she represents; it is one of acknowledged imperfection and inferiority, of servitude (by reason of its many limitations) not of liberty—despite its relative privileges, of fear rather than of love which "casteth out fear," even as Hagar and Ishmael were cast forth at the instance of Sarah. But St. Paul recalls a further fact, which confirms the association of Hagar with Sinai and brings him face to face with his actual Jewish opponents: *For Sinai is a mountain of Arabia*, the very country that became in the providence of God the home of Ishmael and his posterity, *and it answereth*, or is near of kin in character, *to the Jerusalem which now is*, the present centre and home of Judaism, *and which is in bondage with her children*, still choosing to bear the yoke of the Mosaic Law abrogated by Christ.

And now the apostle, instead of balancing his train of thought with an equally full description of the New Covenant, exclaims with characteristic brevity and abruptness: *But the Jerusalem which is above*, "the heavenly Jerusalem," the Church of God's own Son, Jesus Christ, *is free—which is our mother*, she who is fast gathering into her world-wide embrace all true children of Abraham, Jew and gentile alike: *For it is written in Isaiah*, prophesying not of the Jewish but of the Christian Church.

seeing not the earthly but "the heavenly Jerusalem," blessing not Hagar "that hath the husband" but Sarah the "barren" and desolate—

*Rejoice thou barren one that bringest not forth, cry out and shout, thou that travailest not,*

*For many are the children of the desolate one, more than of her that hath a husband.*

With this quotation St. Paul's main line of thought ends. The following verse marks the starting-point of his practical exhortations which present no serious difficulty.

The lesson of the epistle is that of fidelity to the faith with its unlimited blessing and privileges. Not for naught did Christ die. (1) It is utter folly to forsake the faith of Christ. Stand fast! Be not seduced even by "an angel from heaven"; for justness cometh "through faith in Christ Jesus." (2) Not foolish only, but criminal. To be "severed from Christ" is to be "fallen from grace." It is the folly and sin of the prodigal who left his home and wasted his substance. He looked for freedom and found himself a famishing slave.

#### *Passion Sunday.*

*Epistle.* (Hebrews ix. 11-15.)

Passion Sunday ushers in Passiontide, which closes with the spectacle of the Son of God crucified and bleeding to death. "Blood," "the blood of Christ," "His own blood"—are the words that empurple to-day's epistle. Is there greater love than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends? Yea—that God die for His enemies!

If we are lost in admiration, we are lost likewise in mystery. Why did God's incarnate Son die on man's behalf? "To teach us"—is the answer of many non-Catholics; to set before us a perfect example of love and self-sacrifice and incite us to imitate Him. Not for a moment does the Catholic Church deny that the passion of Christ provides an example of the highest moral worth, but she also affirms most emphatically that His blood was given for our ransom, that His death was more than a lesson of love for us—it was an act whereby God the Father was propitiated and was reconciled with man. Let us note the favourite words of St. Paul, which while laden with mystery are yet pregnant with meaning: redemption, propitiation, atonement, reconciliation.

*Redemption*: "We have redemption through His blood" (Eph. i. 7). To redeem is to buy back, to recover by the payment of a price or ransom; and it was God the Father who in His wisdom demanded a ransom as the price of our deliverance, and God the Son, "Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all men" (I Tim. ii. 6). "Ye were redeemed not with perishable silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ" (I Peter i. 18-19). "Ye have been bought at a great

price" (I Cor. vi. 20). Satan it was who held men captive; but nothing in the notion of redemption requires that the ransom be paid to the gaoler. Enough that it be paid to him by whose permissive will and just warrant the captive is detained. But stand amazed at your value! Worth a Calvary of pain! Worth the life-blood of God's own Son!

*Propitiation, Atonement, Reconciliation*: St. Paul teaches that on Calvary Jesus was set forth by God as a means of "propitiation by His blood" (Rom. iii. 25). So too I John ii. 2: "He is a propitiation for our sins . . . for those of the whole world." To propitiate a person is to appease or placate one who is offended and angry, to make him favourably disposed and willing to forgive. Sin aroused the anger of God against men. It is "Jesus who hath rescued us from the wrath to come" (I Thess. i. 10). Sin created enmity between God and man; but Jesus made *atonement*. To atone is to set "at one" those who are at variance, to make peace between persons who are estranged, to reconcile enemies. And Jesus became "a merciful and faithful High Priest to atone for the sins of the people" (Heb. ii. 17). And "when we were enemies we were *reconciled* to God through the death of His Son" (Rom. v. 10). "Through Him we have access to the Father" (Eph. ii. 18). For "it hath pleased the Father through His beloved Son to reconcile all things to Himself . . . making peace through the blood of His cross. And whereas ye were at one time alienated and at enmity . . . yet now Christ hath reconciled you through His death" (Col. i. 19-20). "And therefore," concludes our epistle, "He is the *Mediator* of the New Testament, that by means of His death . . . they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

Each of these luminous statements of St. Paul presents one aspect, one glowing facet of a many-sided truth; together they help to a realization of the complete beauty and harmony of God's greatest work. But perhaps no single word better sums up the office of the Redeemer than that word *Mediator*. A mediator is one who stands in the midst between two estranged parties to effect a renewal of friendship; and "there is one God, one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all men" (I Tim. ii. 5-6). He is the one and only Mediator of reconciliation. "In none other is there salvation; for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12). The participated mediation of saints and angels, even that of Mary—herself most gloriously redeemed by the Precious Blood—is but one of intercession, of pleading that were powerless had not the blood of Jesus first cried out for mercy and prevailed. His mediation was perfect because perfect, too, was His influence with the persons estranged. His power was more than that of a mother standing between her husband and her child. As God-Man He identified Himself with both sides, made due and adequate satisfaction, and heaven and earth



embraced. In the Person of Christ *Veritas (increata) de terra orta est, et Justitia de cælo prospexit*. One who was divine only could not satisfy, for man—not God—had incurred the debt. And one who was human only could not satisfy, for man was guilty—was the enemy—unacceptable—a *persona non grata*; and even a guiltless man is so infinitely inferior to God as to be utterly incompetent to make good an injury of infinite gravity. Shall the dust arise and claim to be honoured of God? But behold our Mediator, Christ Jesus, the incarnate Son of God! In His divine nature He is the equal in majesty of the Father offended; in His human nature—the sinless and acceptable representative of men offending, His every act the act of a divine Person and so of infinite worth. Shall we wonder then that, at the outset of His ministry of mediation, “behold, a voice from the heavens, saying, ‘This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.’”

Why, lastly, did Christ choose to mediate “by means of His death”? Why the way of the cross—the way of blood? To manifest the malice of sin, the measure of His own charity, the meanness of ours; but also because the way of sacrifice is in harmony with the deepest instincts of our nature. Note the grades of honour that men pay to their fellow men—equals to equals, a child to his parent, a priest to his bishop, the bishop to the Pope. The higher the dignity, the greater the chosen mark of honour. But the majesty of God is unique, and unique the acknowledged sign of His supreme dominion, viz., Sacrifice. As men could not lawfully slay and sacrifice themselves, they found substitutes and sacrificed *them*. Christ was no mere man, but the divine Master of His own life and could dispose of it as He willed (John x. 18). And so when He chose to satisfy for men who had rejected the supreme authority of God, He—our High Priest and Victim—sacrificed Himself upon the altar of the cross and “by His own blood obtained eternal redemption.”

#### *Palm Sunday.*

##### *The Via Crucis: Mary's Love and Compassion.*

*Text*: “O all ye that pass by the way . . .” (Lam. i. 12). Three pictures: I. *Nazareth*. The home of Jesus, Mary and Joseph. No home of earth so like unto heaven! Joseph—humbly adoring and devoted; Mary—full of grace, her face a vision of serene joy, her eyes reflecting a heaven of love as they gaze upon the Child at her side, her only Child, her Boy! Of all the sons of men He is the most beautiful and winning, exquisitely and perfectly fashioned by the Holy Ghost. His soul has the comeliness of every virtue. There is heaven in His eyes, grace upon His lips, love in every look, charm in every word, the divine in every movement. That Child is God; that mother—God’s mother. His glance thrills her. His lightest touch is ecstasy, His caress—heaven. Measure her love: think of the most loving mother ever known; of the most lovable child ever seen; gather together into His one person all the graces and

charms of all lovable children, and gather together in the mother's heart all the intense and absorbing affection of all loving mothers; double it, treble it, multiply it a thousand-fold, and not yet have you guessed, even remotely, the intensity and immensity of Mary's love for Jesus. There is no measure of *her* love, for there is no measure of *His* loveliness; He is God! Above her Son there is no one whose claims can limit her love. Caress Him? She *adores* Him, the day long, the night through; and the depth of her love now marks the depth of her agony hereafter.

There is one great shadow, the shadow of the cross, growing more sharply defined as the years pass by. Mary knows of the approaching Passion. The prophets had foretold it, vividly and in detail, and Mary—as full of wisdom as of grace—understood aright. Jesus too, must have told her. Surely, if He told His apostles, He would not refrain from speaking to His own mother of what was ever uppermost in His thoughts and desires—His Passion. Already, when He is leaving her to begin His ministry, the mother sees its close—Calvary.

II. *Jerusalem*: The Via Crucis. Mary, attended by the disciple whom Jesus loved, is waiting by the wayside to meet her Son as He passes to Calvary. Not long ago He bade her farewell. She knew what it meant; she read His purpose, and marked in His looks the resolution and the fear, and the love stronger than the fear. She would not ask Him not to go. The Father willed it; He, too, willed it; she must will it likewise. And He was going to die for her!—for her freedom from sin granted in view of the foreseen royal ransom of her Son's blood. Presently she will see Him at His work of love. St. John has told her of her Son's betrayal and capture, of His trial and condemnation. His apostles have fled—all save one; but His mother—she must let Him know that His mother is loving and faithful unto death. In this hour will He not be looking for a mother's love and sympathy?

She hears in the distance the confused roar of the rabble; then, hard by and distinctly, the blasphemies hurled at Him from all sides; now He is close upon her. Is that her Son—that man bowed beneath the cross? Is that her life's light, her heart's love, her soul's God? Is that thorn-crowned head the head that once nestled so peacefully upon her breast? Is that bruised and bleeding face the face of her child—the beautiful face that had thrilled her! He looks up, and their eyes meet, with a world of love and suffering in His—a world of love and sympathy in hers. But see how the soldiers push her aside; and she would carry His cross for Him if they would let her! All she can do is to follow in His footsteps, sharing His load of sorrow, making the way of the cross in very truth, pausing in agony when He falls and falls again, blessing with a mother's blessing the Cyrenean who helps Him, Veronica who ministers, the daughters of Jerusalem who show their sympathy. And now—the end.

III. *Calvary.* The mother and the apostle take their stand outside the ring of soldiery. She cannot yet draw near. The executioners hide Him from view. But her senses are alert. She knows they are preparing to crucify Him—removing the clothes from His bleeding body. Often had she dressed and undressed Him in infancy, but with what reverence and gentleness! They who strip Him now are rough and rude, without heart and without honour. Then she hears that dreaded sound—the hard ringing blows of the hammer. They are driving the nails through the delicate hands of her Son, the hands she had held so tenderly, kissed so reverently, clasped so lovingly. And the feet—how long it seems before the feet are fastened too. At last the blows cease; and in the new-born silence she catches His first words: “Father, forgive them.” And Mary, her will one with His, repeats: “Father, forgive them.”

And now they are raising the cross; and presently she sees the form of her Son rise above the heads of the crowd, and hears the yell of triumph with which they greet their victim. Pity the mother of God! Her Son is dying, and no one cares, no one loves Him. See how they rail at Him and toss their heads and cry: “Son of God, come down and save thyself!” But for their sakes—to save *them*—He stays.

Darkness creeps over Calvary, and fear over the crowd which thins and melts away; and the mother presses forward and stands at last close beside her Son. O all ye that pass . . . attend and see . . . her sorrow. In an agony of grief she first looks up into His adorable face and into those divine eyes that look down into hers with filial recognition. He knew that she would come; He wanted her to come—wanted her to be the last divinely-delicate touch in the picture that was meant to move the world to the worship of compassion. Then her gaze travels slowly over His whole form from head to foot, and she realizes what men have done to Him, her Son, their God. There are two great nails through the tender palms, two more through the swollen feet. He is hanging by four living wounds. Upon His head—a crown of thorns, His eyes bloodshot with pain, His face all marred and bruised. Now, too, she sees that they have scourged Him—scourged Him so cruelly that the sacred flesh is hanging in tatters from His shoulders, back, and sides, “There is no beauty in Him now, nor comeliness.” She does not speak. What could she say to comfort Him? She cannot reach to wipe the blood from His eyes; she may not bathe His brow or moisten His lips or ease His body; she cannot touch Him without adding to His pain. And when He cries aloud: “My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?”—the mother understands that, deep and wide as is her sympathy, it is all too little to fill the great void in His Sacred Heart. So in silence she watches the shadow of death creep over Him, watches the body pale and droop, watches the lips that are moving in prayer—and the eyes that keep turning towards her and turning away again with a look of increased suffering. Once only does

He speak to her—to tell that St. John will cherish her when He Himself is gone. Then—"it is finished"—and bowing His head, He gives up His spirit. "It is finished"; for Him, yes; for her, no; many a time in the years to come will she make the way of the Cross, alone.

She waits on beside the cross. All that she loves best in Heaven or on earth is hanging there. She sees the spear run deep into that Sacred Heart. The pain is hers, not His. She watches them take the Body down. Now that her Jesus is beyond pain, she asks that she may hold Him in her arms once more, as she held Him when He was her little one. Behold her now and for ever the Christian monument of monumental love and compassion!

Then "they carried the Body of Jesus to bury it, accompanied by His holy mother, who arranged it in the sepulchre with her own hands. They then closed the tomb and all withdrew."

*Easter Sunday.*

*The Resurrection.*

*Text:* "Ye seek Jesus Who was crucified. He is risen!" To-day we keep "the feast of feasts, the Resurrection of Our Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ" (Rom. Martyrology). "This is the day which the Lord hath made; let us be glad and rejoice therein," for on this day Jesus proved the truth of His claim to be the eternal Son of God, a divine Person, only a divine Person, not a human person at all.

"Jesus, though He was by nature God, emptied Himself by becoming like unto men." Because He thus humbled Himself, men were scandalized; they did not take Him for what He really was. Yet everything proclaimed Him to be more than man. *Heaven* proclaimed Him—thrice—in His Annunciation, and at His Baptism and Transfiguration. *Hell* proclaimed Him—cf. Mark iii. 11; v. 7. *His friends* proclaimed Him—the Baptist (John i. 34) and Martha (John xi. 27). *The apostles* proclaimed Him—after the stilling of the tempest (Matt. xiv. 33), and at Cæsarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 16). What is of greatest moment, *Jesus Himself* proclaimed Himself. After thirty years of hidden life He came forth into the midst of men; and though He did not thunder and flash His Godhead upon them, yet in unmistakable and unmistakable terms, in words that amazed men then beyond our present conception, He proclaimed that He was the Son of God, the Lawgiver, Ruler and Judge of the world, greater than Moses the mediator, than Solomon wisest of men, than Jonah the prophet of God; that He was Master of Satan, Lord of the Sabbath, the Light of the world, Truth incarnate, the Resurrection and the Life; that His one life was ransom for the world's millions; that He pre-existed Abraham; that God was His Father, that He was equal to the Father, that each understood the other perfectly, that He and the Father were one, that whoso saw Him saw the Father. Challenged

at last by the high priest in high court to say once and for all whether He were truly the Son of God, He uttered an unqualified "I am"—only to be called a blasphemer! (Mark xiv. 62).

What did He offer in proof of these stupendous claims? Throughout His ministry, daily and hourly, evidence of His true Divinity, no less than of His true humanity, shone forth irresistibly through the mystery of His Person like sunlight through the mists of the morning. If He lived humanly, He also lived divinely, as only a God incarnate could live. He lived holly—with the holiness of God: "which of you doth convict Me of sin?" He spoke divinely—with the wisdom of God: "never did man speak as this man." He acted divinely—with the power of God: "we never saw the like." Men's minds passed rapidly from attention to wonder ("who is this?"), from wonder to doubt ("how long dost Thou hold our souls in suspense?"), from doubt to indignation and violence; for when He replied—"I and the Father are one"—they took up stones to stone Him "for blasphemy, because being a man Thou makest Thyself God" (John x. 22-38). Again and again He appealed to His deeds in proof of His words: "The works which I do in the name of My Father, these witness concerning Me"; "though ye believe not Myself, believe the works." To His works then we shall go, and to one in particular—the miracle of miracles, His self-resuscitation from the dead.

Moses, Josue, Elias, Eliseus, prophets and saints have worked miracles even more striking, may be, than those of Our Lord, but not so numerous or so various as His. Yet not on the number and variety of His miracles did Christ rely so much as upon His distinctive purpose and manner of action. He wrought them in proof of His own Divinity; and He wrought them in a way that befitted God alone. He let men see that the divine power within Him, the virtue that went forth from Him and healed all, was His very own, inherent in His own Person, His own abiding attribute and permanent possession; not proceeding from another Being above Him and greater than Himself, not a passing gift granted in answer to prayer. And so He wrought whatsoever wonders He willed, whensoever He willed, howsoever He willed, and just with His will ("I will; be thou made clean"). He did not plead for power, or refer it to a source higher than Himself. He was simply and calmly, majestically and abruptly *imperious*. He *commanded* and cried out as only the Lord of creation and the Author of life would cry out: "Peace, tempest; be still!" "Young man, I say to thee arise!" "Lazarus, come forth!" And straightway, at His command, diseases and devils and death obeyed their Master.

And yet—mark this well—though daily and hourly He had lived and spoken and acted divinely, He was ready as it were to waive these proofs of His Godhead, to leave them out of account, and to let His claim stand or fall by one unique and supreme test—the test of self-resuscitation. Men have mastered

many forces, but never the dominion of death. To be utterly impotent in the face of death, to be mortal, is the mark of man; nor ever has man, having yielded to death, turned again and with his own hand dealt death its own death-blow and issued triumphant from the tomb. But Jesus said of Himself: "I lay down My life, that I may take it up again. No one taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take up again." "Destroy this temple (He was speaking of the temple of His body) and in three days I will raise it up again." The sign for which His very enemies had asked was lesser far than this—"a sign from Heaven"—a voice, a peal of thunder, a flash of lightning. And Jesus had answered: "a sign shall not be given, except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah was in the belly of the whale three days, so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days." Thrice He had predicted His own Passion and Death, and thrice He had added: "after three days I will rise again."

Here was a test worthy of God! He let them work their will with Him, crucify Him, slay Him, pierce His dead body. bury Him, seal the stone, and set guards. It was the greatest crisis in all history. Would He—could He—keep His word? He had deliberately staked everything—His life's work—on this one miracle of miracles. If He failed now in His own self-chosen test, then all was over with Him and His doctrine and His plans and His so-called Kingdom. *He* was no God, nor was God with Him, Who failed to keep His word—failed to fulfil even the least promise or prediction. *He* was not the Resurrection and the Life, Who could not bring a body and soul together again and raise His own humanity from the grave. Nay, He was proved to be just another cunning impostor, or at best a deluded madman. As for us, "if Christ is not risen, vain truly is our preaching, vain too your faith" and "we who have set our hopes in Christ, we are more to be pitied than all men." But if He did not fail, if He kept His word, if He triumphed, then we who have staked all on Jesus Christ—we have staked well; we have won! And Jesus failed not. "Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, Who was crucified. He is risen!" And we, too, shall see Him, as He has told us; for the glory of His Resurrection is reflected back upon all His works and words, and His promises glow with the steady light of the Eternal Word of God. "And this is the victory which hath conquered the world, our faith."



## MORAL CASES

### BIRTH CONTROL AND GOOD FAITH.

Is it true, as stated recently in the *Church Times*, that some manuals of Moral Theology teach the lawfulness of allowing certain people to remain invincibly ignorant concerning the malice of Birth Control?

### REPLY.

The passage to which our correspondent refers is found in a review of a book entitled *A Manual for Confessors*, by F. G. Belton, B.A., F.C.S., Hon. Canon of Birmingham Cathedral (Mowbray, 1931). The reviewer writes: "It is now well-known that some Roman Catholic text-books of Moral Theology use language which suggests that relief from the total prohibition of contraceptives may be found in the principle of 'invincible error.' And it is certainly true that, in the hands of a wise confessor, this principle is of exceptional value as a safeguard against legalism; while a lax appeal to it may easily produce moral chaos. The one notable flaw in Canon Belton's book is his failure to bring the importance of this whole question of conscientious error to the notice of his readers."<sup>1</sup>

I am not familiar with Canon Belton's book. It is, I believe, of considerable authority amongst our Anglican brethren and, if it at all resembles other books of this type, the author probably relies very considerably upon the writings of Catholic moral theologians. He appears, perhaps, to have studied them more profoundly than his reviewer has done, and his alleged failure to appreciate their principle of "invincible error" may be, in reality, a very fruitful result of his reading. For the doctrine of the moral theologians has passed through a certain development during the last half-century, keeping pace with the growth of this vice, but their teaching on the matter and on the kindred subjects of sterilization and abortion, following the instructions of the Holy See, has developed in the direction of strictness not of laxity. In many other moral questions, but not in this one, a tendency towards a liberal interpretation of the law can sometimes be observed.

The grave admonition in the Encyclical *Casti Connubii* does no more than repeat and stress the accepted doctrine. "We admonish, therefore, priests who hear confessions and others who have the care of souls, in virtue of Our supreme authority and in our solicitude for the salvation of souls, not to allow the faithful entrusted to them to err regarding this most grave law of God; much more, that they keep themselves immune from such false opinions, in no way conniving in them. If any

<sup>1</sup> *Church Times*, November 23, 1931.

confessor or pastor of souls, which may God forbid, lead the faithful entrusted to him into these errors or should at least confirm them by approval or guilty silence, let him be mindful of the fact that he must render a strict account to God, the Supreme Judge, for the betrayal of his sacred trust, and let him take to himself the words of Christ: 'They are blind and leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit' Matt. xv. 14."<sup>2</sup>

That penitents should sometimes rather be left in good faith, due to invincible ignorance, than be informed of their obligations and be put henceforth in bad faith, is a valuable principle in the guidance of souls. The authors always suppose that it is going to be employed by a prudent man, and a prudent man will make sure that he understands the principle before he attempts to apply it. Otherwise he is a reckless, dangerous and blind guide, a peril to himself and to the faithful. Amongst other conditions for the right use of this principle, it can be applied only to clear cases of *invincible* ignorance, where no good will result from giving information, and where the priest's silence will not be a cause of scandal. Now, whatever may have been the situation a few years back, it is almost inconceivable that any Catholic should nowadays be blissfully and inculpably ignorant of the fact that the Church condemns the use of contraceptives as a grave breach of the natural law. The subject is discussed by judges, journalists and novelists, and every man in the street knows that the Catholic Church is the determined enemy of contraception. Moreover, it is scarcely conceivable that a confessor's silence could be anything else but a cause of scandal.

The rule, therefore, is that a confessor cannot allow penitents to continue in this vice undisturbed, as the Holy See has explicitly declared: "I. Quando adest fundata suspicio, poenitentem, qui de Onanismo omnino silet, huic crimini esse addictum, num Confessario liceat a prudenti et discreta interrogatione abstinere, eo quod praevideat plures a bona fide exturbandos, multosque Sacramenta deserturos esse? Annon potius teneatur Confessarius prudenter et discrete interrogare? II. An Confessarius, qui, sive ex spontanea confessione, sive ex prudenti interrogatione, cognoscit, poenitentem esse onanistam, teneatur illum de huius peccati gravitate, aequae ac de aliorum peccatorum mortalium, monere, eumque (uti ait Rituale Romanum) paterna charitate reprehendere, eique absolutionem tunc solum impertiri, cum sufficientibus signis constet eundem dolere de praeterito, et habere propositum non amplius onanistice agendi? Resp. Ad I. Regulariter negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam. Ad II. Affirmative juxta doctrinas probatorum Auctorum."<sup>3</sup>

The moral theologians have interpreted the word *regulariter*

<sup>2</sup> C.T.S. Translation p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> S. Penit. March 10, 1886. The full text is in *Aerthys-Damen* II §917.

of this answer in the sense that it is, theoretically, at least, possible to imagine a case in which good faith exists, owing to complete invincible ignorance of the malice of the action, together with all the other conditions necessary before the principle can be applied.<sup>4</sup> The exception from the common rule refers solely to the case of allowing a confessor to remain silent and refrain from questioning a penitent suspected of this vice. A priest who refuses to instruct when asked is committing a grave wrong, and if he were to tell penitents that they could continue in the vice (which, as the Holy Father says, may God forbid) he is liable to the grave ecclesiastical penalties *contra sollicitantes*.

Whatever, therefore, may be the value of the principle concerning invincible ignorance and good faith, one must be very slow to apply it to the matter under discussion, because the conditions for its lawful application are scarcely ever realized and, as time goes on, I imagine that all mention of this rare theoretical exception to the general law will cease to find a place in the manuals of the Moral Theologians.

E. J. MAHONEY.

#### MEMORIAL TABLETS IN CHURCHES.

Is there any law regulating the erection of memorial tablets in Churches?

#### REPLY.

It is forbidden to place memorial tablets on the walls of Churches unless the bodies of the persons commemorated may lawfully be buried therein.<sup>5</sup> Canon 1205 §2 enumerates the eminent persons whose bodies may lawfully be interred in Churches, namely, Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots and Prelates *nullius* and persons of regal condition. From the documents quoted in this reply of the Congregation of Rites it is clear that the prohibition is principally directed against an abuse of the rights claimed by founders and patrons of Churches, but in nearly every case of the proposed erection of a memorial tablet the person concerned is a benefactor of the Church. If founders and patrons and benefactors are not entitled to mural tablets, a fortiori those persons are included in the prohibition who have no special title beyond that of dying in union with the Church.

Like every other ecclesiastical law it may be dispensed provided a proper authorization is obtained. The *Ami du Clergé*<sup>6</sup> interprets the decree in the sense that War Memorials containing the names of the fallen are not included therein,

<sup>4</sup> e.g., De Smet *De Matrimonio* §241; Tanquerey *Theologia Moralís, Supplementum* §68.

<sup>5</sup> S.C.R., October 20, 1922, *Decreta Authentica* n. 4376.

<sup>6</sup> 1922, page 759.

since they are not erected for the praise of an individual patron or benefactor but are rather a necrology in metal or stone. If this interpretation seems inadequate it may be said, alternatively, that the Church tolerates this exception, or certainly would tolerate it if the proper authority were approached, in order to avoid giving grave offence to the families of the fallen.

It should also be noted that the decree does not enjoin the removal of tablets already in existence, an interference which would always cause pain to the relatives who had them erected with the implied sanction of ecclesiastical authority. But the law is a most useful one to remember and cite when necessary, and it is a salutary check on a practice which, if unrestricted, would convert a parish Church into a Mausoleum.

E. J. M.

#### AN AMEN.

Some Missals indicate that the *Amen* is to be said by the priest *submissa voce*, others direct it to be said *secrete*. Which is the more correct?

#### REPLY.

The correct rubric is that which is found in all Missals printed at least since the 1920 Editio Typica,<sup>7</sup> "*Sacerdos secrete dicit AMEN.*" Previous to this date "*secrete*" is found in some editions and "*submissa voce*" in others. It is a small point which seems to have escaped the attention of those commentators on the Editio Typica to whom I have been able to refer.

The reason for the direction "*submissa voce*" is, I suppose, the fact that in a High Mass the choir is singing AMEN at the same time. Tit. XVI, n. 3 of the Rubricae Generales directs "*Alia quae in Missa privata dicuntur clara voce, in Missa solemni a celebrante dicuntur submissa voce.*" The later direction to say the word "*secrete*" is a further interpretation of the same principle; in fact, it would seem that the practice of saying the whole of the Canon "*secrete*" originated with the natural desire of the celebrant to continue the Eucharistic Prayer while the Sanctus was being sung.<sup>8</sup> The difference between the two voices is that "*secrete*" means a tone of voice which can be heard by the priest but not by those standing around; "*submissa voce*" means a tone which can be heard by the servers and ministers but not by the whole congregation.

E. J. M.

#### THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

Is it lawful to use the privilege of Canon 858 §2 in favour of a person whose disease makes it impossible to keep the fast, but who is able to attend Mass in the Church?

<sup>7</sup> A.A.S., 1920, XII, p. 448.

<sup>8</sup> Fortescue, ROMAN MASS p. 323.

## REPLY.

Canon 858 §2 states: "Infirmi tamen qui jam a mense decumbunt sine certa spe ut cito convalescant, de prudenti confessarii consilio sanctissimam Eucharistiam sumere possunt semel aut bis in hebdomada, etsi aliquam medicinam vel aliquid per modum potus antea sumpserint." The Canon is adapted from a decree of the Congregation of the Council December 7th, 1906, which has given rise to lengthy discussions concerning its right interpretation on a variety of points. The *dubium* raised by our correspondent has been discussed since 1907 by the authors, but has not yet been authoritatively resolved by the Holy See. We are left, therefore, with the interpretation of the theologians and canonists.

(1) The negative view has been defended by many on the ground that the legislation, being a modification of a general law, is of strict interpretation and must not be extended to circumstances not actually mentioned in the text. The law speaks of *infirmi qui decumbunt*, "decumbunt" meaning not only those confined to their beds, but also those whose illness permits them to rise for some hours during the day, according to the official interpretation of the same Congregation on March 6th, 1907. But it is considered, by the authors who adopt the stricter view, that the decree contemplates the case of Communion of the Sick in their homes and does not include those persons whose illness permits them to go out to Mass. Otherwise laxity would soon creep in and the strict and ancient law concerning the Eucharistic fast would gradually disappear.<sup>9</sup>

(2) The affirmative and liberal view was held by Ferreres from the time the decree was given,<sup>10</sup> although he does not mention the point in his *Moral Theology*.<sup>11</sup> The argument in its favour derives much force from the official interpretation of March 6th, 1907, and it would seem unreasonable to allow sick people to communicate not fasting in their homes and refuse them permission outside solely because they are capable of reaching the Church. Vermeersch who interpreted the decree in the strict sense, on its first appearance,<sup>12</sup> observes in his *Moral Theology*<sup>13</sup> "Attamen usus invaluit benigne intelligendi vocem *decumbentes*, ita ut etiam ii infirmi qui se ad ecclesiam conferre possunt facultate uti permittantur." This view is held by Cappello<sup>14</sup> without any hesitation whatever, "indubitanter putamus," and the authors are, generally speaking, now inclined to the liberal opinion. Cappello observes that the law is, indeed, of strict

<sup>9</sup> Ojetti *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, n. 2347; and amongst post Code writers, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* XXIV. 1924, p. 638; Génicot *Theologia Moralis* ed. 1919, n. 202; Prümmer *Theologia Moralis* III, §202 ed. 1923.

<sup>10</sup> *Razon y Fe*, February, 1907, p. 240.

<sup>11</sup> II n. 439, ed. 1919.

<sup>12</sup> *Periodica*, Vol. II, n. 161, page 182.

<sup>13</sup> III, §396.

<sup>14</sup> *De Sacramentis*, I, §506.

interpretation, but it does not contain any restrictive clause regarding the sick who can walk out, and we are not, therefore, entitled to insert this restriction. I gather that the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* now favours this opinion.<sup>15</sup> Prümmer was able to say, in 1923, that the strict view was the *sententia communis*, but it is so no longer.

We may justly conclude, therefore, pending any decision from the Holy See, that the law may be interpreted to include sick people who are able to walk out to the Church, provided that all the other conditions are verified. It would take us far beyond the terms of this question to discuss adequately each of these conditions. At any rate, even the most scrupulous priest could adopt the interpretation, until an indult *ad cautelam* is obtained, a permission which would be granted quite easily.

E. J. M.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Jus Pontificium*, 1930, p. 215.



## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

It is one of the minor sorrows of a reviewer of books on Scripture that he cannot more often be directly practical in his recommendations, since many of the works that come under review are destined rather for the specialist than for the ordinary reader. Hence, it is all the more pleasant, when the opportunity comes, to be able to call attention to books that are likely to be of immediate use for preaching and instruction. Among books of this kind, *The Epistles of the Sundays and Festivals*, by the late Cornelius Canon Ryan, D.D.,<sup>1</sup> is of quite special importance. Canon Ryan's earlier work on *The Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals* has for some years been of great service in furnishing abundant matter for sermons and homilies, and its good qualities are found, quite undiminished, in the recently published work on the Epistles. The plan of the work is to print a parallel Greek and Latin text of the Epistle, followed by an English translation, and then to give a very full explanation of each verse with all possible assistance from linguistics, exegesis, and theology. Finally, a set of moral reflections has been added to bring out all the points of special homiletic interest. It will be seen that the chief aim of Canon Ryan's book is not to provide ready-made sermons (one may ask in passing whether such sermons are of real value to any preacher of the smallest originality), but to supply the materials out of which sermons can be constructed. The book is especially welcome in view of the tendency, noted by Fr. O'Dowd in his excellent work on *Preaching* (p. 149), on the part of preachers to neglect the explanation of the epistles on account of their greater difficulty as compared with the Gospels. The work of exposition has been carried out with great care by the editors, and the printing, binding and general appearance of this important book are a credit to the house of Gill. Frequent references to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament occur and quotations are made in a really beautiful fount of Hebrew type. One may be allowed to wish that the Hebrew text had always been immediately followed by a literal translation, that a more critical Greek text than that of Brandscheid had been chosen, and that the English translation given had been that of the Westminster Version, instead of the Douay. It is, however, only fair to add that the precise sense of any text is carefully explained

<sup>1</sup> M. H. Gill, Dublin. 2 vols. pp. cix.+327 and vi.+474. Price £2 2s. od. the set.

in the accompanying notes. It is to be hoped that this admirable book will have a sale in proportion to its merits.

The number of really useful books on the parables of Our Lord is not a large one, and there was room for the two volumes of the *Parabolae selectae Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, by Père Jac.-M. Vosté, O.P., D.S.S., the Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Collegio Angelico.<sup>2</sup> Père Vosté's earlier works on Thessalonians, Ephesians and St. John have already proved that he is a master of clear interpretation and his recent appointments as Consultor of the Biblical Commission and of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches show that he is regarded as eminently safe and reliable. The first volume of the present work contains an introduction to the Parables, which should be read in conjunction with the author's earlier treatise, *De Natura et Interpretatione Parabolarum*,<sup>3</sup> and this is followed by the dogmatic parables concerning the nature of the Kingdom of God and its members. The second volume treats of the moral and eschatological parables and has an appendix on the allegories of St. John's Gospel. Père Vosté's method is to explain as fully as possible the circumstances in which a parable was uttered, to give a careful explanation of the sense of each verse, to summarize the doctrinal content, and to end with a history of the interpretation of the parable and a useful series of extracts from patristic commentaries. It would, I think, be difficult to find a more serviceable book for the preacher, who often cannot spare the time to consult a multitude of commentaries and special treatises. The clearness of Père Vosté's explanations is well seconded by the breadth of his reading in English, French, German, Flemish and Italian, and Protestant scholars have been impressed by his acquaintance with works in our language. (See the *Expository Times*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 23-24: "An attractive lecturer with a fine voice, he is also a lucid expositor. He has the command of a simple Latin vocabulary, which serves to express without effort his very accurate and extensive scholarship. . . . One striking thing is his familiarity with English and English editors. He has the list of English commentators without an omission in his bibliography [to Ephesians] and he shows throughout the commentary that he knows both how to use and how to criticize them.") He has given us many good books, but none more practical and mature than this great work on the Parables.

The *Manuel d'Etudes Bibliques* of MM. Lusseau and Collomb continues to supply a real want. The second part of Tome V<sup>4</sup> provides special introductions and commentaries on the later epistles of St. Paul, the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse. I may draw attention to the excellent commentary on Hebrews

<sup>2</sup> Rome: Pontificium Institutum Internationale "Angelicum." 2 vols. 348+395. Price 60 L. the two volumes.

<sup>3</sup> Rome, 1926. Price 7 L.

<sup>4</sup> Téqui, Paris, 1931. pp. 565. Price 30 francs.

(pp. 216-287), which, though simple, is sufficient for all ordinary purposes. In the bibliography I have missed references to Windisch's contribution to Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* and to Canon Boylan's well-known fascicle in the Westminster Version. I understand that M. Chaine, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Institut Catholique of Lyons, is preparing a volume on Hebrews for the *Etudes bibliques* series of the Dominican Fathers of St. Etienne, Jerusalem. In the meantime, we may be grateful to MM. Lusseau and Collomb for having given us a Catholic commentary on one of the most important books of the New Testament.

Works of general introduction and books of general reference continue to appear. Among these one may mention a new edition of the Oxford *Helps to the Study of the Bible*.<sup>5</sup> Each of the two great University Presses has produced a volume of this kind. The *Cambridge Companion to the Bible* was first issued in 1892 and was re-issued in a much-improved edition, entitled *A Companion to Bible Studies*, in 1916. The Oxford *Helps* dates back to the year 1876, but the last revised edition was issued in 1893. The present revision is called the second edition. It would more accurately be described as *editio altera post typicam*, if one took the 1893 edition as the *editio typica*. Like the earlier editions it is a product of collaboration, and a comparison with the edition of 1893 shows that it has been brought up to date in more ways than one. The 1893 edition was distinctly conservative in character; the new edition, at any rate so far as the Old Testament is concerned, definitely commits itself to the critical hypotheses. So, in the 1893 edition, the Pentateuch is regarded as the work of Moses in the sense that he was at least its original compiler; in the edition of 1931 the earliest document (J) is assigned to the ninth century B.C., though, as usual, it is admitted that "all the sources alike incorporate laws and customs far older than these written records of them, and some of them contain ancient poems, or give written form to narratives that had for generations been told and retold orally" (p. 29). In 1893 the unity of the book of Isaiah was stoutly defended; in 1931 it is alleged that "the last part of the book (40-66) never mentions and has nothing to do with Isaiah, but belongs to a quite different age" (p. 65). In 1893 Daniel was still regarded as the author of the book ascribed to him; in 1931 "various details . . . have led to an increasing recognition of the untenability of this theory" (p. 71) and the book is dated from the times of the Maccabees, i.e., from about 165 B.C. It must, none the less, be admitted that information of this kind is, in the main, confined to the first two hundred pages, and that, in many respects, the volume is a useful and reliable summary of Biblical data. Undoubtedly the most attractive section is the appendix entitled "Bible illustrations," which furnishes a valuable collection of

<sup>5</sup> Oxford University Press. pp. 537+a volume of plates. Price 8s. 6d.

plates illustrative of biblical versions and antiquities. The first two parts (Part I: Illustrations of the Languages, Writings and Versions of the Old and New Testaments; Part II: Illustrations of Old Testament History and Religion) are of a thoroughly representative character and give illustrations, and data regarding them, that could otherwise only be obtained in such expensive works as Gressmann's *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament*. Part III (Illustrations of New Testament History) is admittedly more selective than comprehensive, on account of the enormous wealth and complexity of the available material.

I now come to three non-Catholic works that deal, in general or in particular, with the New Testament books. Professor Wilbert F. Howard's book, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*,<sup>6</sup> is a readable and moderate statement of the author's views on St. John's Gospel. The writer is well-known as the continuator of Dr. J. H. Moulton's classic *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. The first part (Historical Survey) gives a useful account of the work that has been done on the Fourth Gospel since the opening of the century, and its value is enhanced by the author's guarantee that he has entered "in the Bibliography no book or essay which he has not himself read" (p. 10). It may be added that the list contains the titles of about 250 books and articles. The remaining two parts are concerned with a critical investigation of the unity of St. John's Gospel and its relation to the Synoptics, and with a discussion of such problems of interpretation as the Evangelist's use of symbolism and allegory, the "teaching of Jesus in the Johannine idiom," and "the Fourth Evangelist: His message and its abiding value." Many things in the book are extremely welcome, notably Dr. Howard's defence of the general historicity of the Gospel narrative, his generous references to Catholic scholarship (see, for example, his remarks on Lagrange's "unsurpassed authority" as a grammarian and his "great learning and sound judgment," on p. 102), and the conservative tendency shown in his work. I am bound, however, to confess that his general conclusion regarding authorship is not over-clear for, whereas he states on p. 230 that "the Evangelist was almost certainly not the Apostle John," he admits on p. 233 that there is good reason "to accept the obvious intention of the writer of the Gospel and to regard the Beloved Disciple as John the Apostle." Now, if the Beloved Disciple is also the disciple of the "attestation" in John xxi. 24, "who giveth testimony of these things and hath written these things," the conclusion is hard to escape that the Apostle John was the author of the Gospel. Incidentally, I cannot find any reference to the convincing discussion of the attestation passage by the Abbot of Downside in J.T.S., July, 1930.

Dr. R. H. Strachan's *The Historic Jesus in the New*

<sup>6</sup> London: The Epworth Press. pp. 292. Price 7s. 6d.

*Testament*<sup>7</sup> contains much that is interesting, but I cannot regard its main thesis as a reasonable interpretation of the facts. Briefly, this book is an attempt to prove that St. Paul's dominant concern was with the risen Christ, rather than with the life on earth of his Divine Master, that this preoccupation was largely shared by the first Christian preachers, but that, as time went on, "the necessity was more and more strongly felt of giving the story of the human life of Jesus a central place in the Christian Gospel" (p. 10). The words "retold, reinterpreted and revalued," which occur together on p. 11, are frequently used in this book, and one is left with the impression that, in the author's opinion, there were, in the first century, numerous kaleidoscopic changes in the Christian point of view. We may freely allow that, in the extant epistles of St. Paul, the emphasis is largely on the Risen and Glorified Lord, while insisting that the numerous references of the Apostle to Our Lord's life on earth cannot be ignored. (See, for example, Prat: *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, II, pp. 185-89.) But Dr. Strachan's thesis involves the gigantic assumptions that St. Paul's letters were intended to teach his converts the rudiments of the Faith, and that the narrative of the sayings and doings of Jesus received little attention in the primitive catechesis. Actually, as Prat has well maintained (*op. cit.*, II, p. 33): "Quant à Saint Paul, toutes ses lettres sont des énigmes, si l'on suppose les destinataires étrangers aux éléments de la foi chrétienne." And if the supposition is groundless in the case of St. Paul, it has even less application to the Gospels, though Dr. Strachan is anxious to include even the Synoptists among the works that have overstressed one element in the Gospel history.

I cannot attempt a detailed review of Canon Charles E. Raven's *Jesus and the Gospel of Love*.<sup>8</sup> The author has burst into the world with the re-discovery that, despite "the subtleties, perversities, and apostasies of what too often to-day passes for Christianity" (p. 8), the Gospel of Jesus is Light, Life and Love. (Canon Raven is rather fond of capitals. No doubt he would agree with Lewis Carroll's old man "that abstract qualities begin, with capitals alway. The True, the Good, the Beautiful; these are the things that pay.") The work is divided into three parts, which deal respectively with religious experience, with the personality of Jesus, and with the experience of Christians. Like other works by the same author, the present book abounds in paradoxes, and, in general, the references to systems of thought and institutions with which the author is not in sympathy betray remarkably few signs of the Gospel of Love. The depth of Dr. Raven's distaste for Catholicism, institutionalism and supernaturalism may be gauged by a single sentence in the chapter "Christ and the World" (pp. 402-3): "Occasionally there have been eminent scientists and historians

<sup>7</sup> London: The Student Christian Movement Press. pp. 224. Price 7s. 6d.

<sup>8</sup> London: Hodder & Stoughton. pp. 452. Price 15s.

who like Pasteur manage to combine genius in research with a childlike belief in matters of religion, or who like Acton or Von Hügel do not actually break away from their Church: but on the whole the progress of knowledge has derived almost nothing from Catholics." In spite of several characteristic qualifications, the sentence remains one of the most absurd ever written by a man with any claim to scholarship. After this, it is not surprising that a footnote to the same page makes an ill-bred reference to the fertility of the Catholic poor. There is, however, some reason for satisfaction to be found in the two chapters on St. John's Gospel, since Canon Raven inclines to the opinions that the author was the son of Zebedee, that a greater degree of historical value should be allowed to the work than would be conceded by many contemporary critics, and (elsewhere) that in many of the writings of the latter worthies, "there is too frequently evidence of over-ingenuity so perverse as to lose all sense of proportion, of special pleading that outrages common sense, and of a sad lack of humanity and humour" (p. 131).

It is a matter for regret that no thoroughly reliable guide to the Holy Land has recently been published by a Catholic. Perhaps the best of several works of the kind is *La Palestine: Guide historique et pratique*, by the Assumptionist Fathers of Jerusalem, which has run through several editions. In English the standard work on Palestinian geography has been, for many years, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, by Sir George Adam Smith, the Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen, which has just been re-issued in a completely revised edition.<sup>9</sup> Slight exception must be taken to the words "twenty-fifth edition," which appear on the title-page. The book was first issued in 1894, and a fourth edition with supplementary notes appeared in 1896. On that occasion no substantial re-casting of the text took place, and all the so-called "editions" that have been printed since 1896 have been simple re-impressions. It is high time that publishers adopted a fixed principle with regard to such terminology, as also, it may be added, as regards the number of copies that goes to an edition. The present work may be said to have stood the test of nearly forty years' use by experts and, not least, as the new preface records, by Lord Allenby and his staff during the Palestine campaign (p. viii.). A good deal of new matter has now been added, as, for example, in the short but valuable treatment of "The Question of Sychar" in Chapter XVIII. No doubt this most readable of historical geographies has a further long career of usefulness before it. It is one of the very few books of which it can be truthfully said that it should be found in every public institute and college library.

*Palestine Illustrated*, by Frank Scholten,<sup>10</sup> contains a series

<sup>9</sup> London: Hodder & Stoughton. pp. xxviii.+744. Price £1 5s. od

<sup>10</sup> London: Longmans. 2 vols. pp. xxxviii+406 and xxv.+338. Price £4 4s. od.



of about 800 beautifully produced photographs of Jaffa and its environs. Numerous quotations from the Bible, the Talmud and the Koran accompany the illustrations, which are a valuable guide to modern Palestinian life. Some additional information might well have been added for the benefit of those not familiar with Palestinian customs.

A smaller work, *His Testimony is True*, by A. H. A. Simcox,<sup>11</sup> is a reverent, if not very convincing attempt to represent St. John the Evangelist as explaining to St. Mary Magdalene the manner in which he came to compose his Gospel.

Lastly, reference may be made to two works of importance that are not strictly Biblical. *The Zohar*, translated by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon,<sup>12</sup> is the first volume of the new English translation of a great cabbalistic work of the thirteenth century. It is in the form of a commentary on the Pentateuch. The present volume covers the first twenty-two chapters of Genesis. Finally, *The Legacy of Islam*, edited by the late Sir Thomas Arnold and the Rev. Alfred Guillaume,<sup>13</sup> is the fifth volume of the Legacy series. As might be expected in a work produced by the Clarendon Press, the illustrations reach a high level of beauty, and the text is full of accurate information regarding all the aspects of Islamic life and culture. A sentence of Prof. Guillaume's preface deserves to be noted. "No serious student of the Old Testament can afford to dispense with a first-hand knowledge of Arabic" (p. ix.).

## II. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

The problems which are actual at the moment are all connected with the institution of Marriage. If we are to believe the daily Press, the demand for divorce, sterilization and birth control facilities appears to be increasing daily, preached by judges in homilies from the bench, advocated by members of the British Association, and taught by some popular religious leaders in their anxiety to keep abreast of the times. I suppose there will be, one day, a violent reaction against all this. It is something, at least, in addition to the many protests from Catholic Societies, to read the dignified protest by Sir Hubert Bond, in the twelfth Maudsley lecture given in the hall of the British Association, against the more glaring instances of judicial impertinence; something, also, to hear Canon Lyttleton prophesying that the Lambeth Conference will probably reverse their vote, and utter something more in accordance with the mind of Christ; something, likewise, to read Circular 1208 of the Ministry of Health giving a restrictive interpretation to Mem. 153 of the year 1930,

<sup>11</sup> London: John Murray. pp. 118. Price 3s. 6d.

<sup>12</sup> London: The Soncino Press. pp. 390. Price £1 1s. od.

<sup>13</sup> Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. pp. xi.+416. Price 10s. net.

concerning which some detailed information has been sent to the clergy from the Bishops. The new circular directs that Local Authorities have no general power to establish birth control clinics, and what limited powers they possess are strictly incidental to the general purpose of the Maternity and Child Welfare Centres.

We are fortunate in possessing an English journal, the *Catholic Medical Guardian*, in which medico-moral problems can be discussed from the Catholic point of view. There seems to be a close connection between this periodical and its equivalent in Belgium, the *Saint Luc Médical*.<sup>14</sup> It is undoubtedly a compliment to our English contributors to find their articles frequently translated and published in the Belgian journal. Dr. Guchteneere, whose work on Birth Control may be considered the best on the subject, contributes a short article in the *C.M.G.* for October, 1931, discussing the certainty of the *tempus ageneseos*. He returns to the subject, with a more detailed study in *Saint Luc Médical*, 1931, n.6, and the general lines of his conclusions are that the pre-menstrual period is commonly a "safe" period, the exceptions being due to pathological conditions, but the post-menstrual period is extremely doubtful. Discussion on the topic should not be encouraged, except in theological and medical journals, for the knowledge obtained is liable to be abused amongst persons who certainly do not come within the terms of the well-known decision of the Sacred Penitentiary, June 16th, 1889.

Two studies on Sex Morality have been recently noticed in this REVIEW: *Catholic Sex Morality*, by Dr. Rudolf Geiss, and *Sex Instruction*, by Dr. J. J. Walsh (Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, II, pp. 377-378). There is one more which is worth mentioning: *The Case Against Birth Control*, by E. R. Moore, Ph.D.<sup>15</sup> The book, which has a preface by Cardinal Hayes, is a popular yet well-documented statement of the facts, and points out all the dangers of the practice of birth control. The moral argument is popularly presented, and very full appendices give the text of American laws bearing on the subject and extracts from other books.

Amongst the familiar manuals of Moral Theology, in ordinary use amongst the clergy, there is a new edition of Sabetti-Barrett,<sup>16</sup> justly popular for its concise and practical arrangement. There is also the first volume of an entirely new manual, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, by B. H. Merkelbach, O.P.<sup>17</sup> The author's volume *De Principiis* appears at a moment when we are lamenting the death of his fellow Dominican, Fr. Prümmer, O.P., and the new work will greatly help to continue the Dominican tradition in Moral Theology. It resembles the manual

<sup>14</sup> Rue Blanche, Brussels.

<sup>15</sup> Appleton & Co., 1931. 304 pages. 8s. 6d.

<sup>16</sup> Pustet, 1931.

<sup>17</sup> Desclée, 1931. 756 pages. 45 fr.

of Fr. Prümmer in a most faithful adherence to the teaching of S. Thomas, and the exposition is clear and simple, well adapted to the intelligence of a student approaching the subject for the first time. (Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. I, p. 525, *Theologia Moralis Thomistica*.) We are given an adequate study of the first five questions of the *Prima-Secundae* of the Summa, and a more detailed examination of the ethical distinction between good and evil than is generally found in manuals. The remaining sections, *De Legibus*, *De Virtutibus in Genere*, *De Virtutibus Theologicis*, follow the accepted arrangement of these treatises. In one very important point this first volume does no more than whet the intellectual appetite of the seeker after truth. The learned author does not reveal his views about Probabilism. There was a time when a theologian desiring a quiet life kept his views on this subject discreetly hidden: he held the views of a prudent man and a prudent man kept them to himself. But this is not exactly the reason for Fr. Merkelbach declining to expound the true system for solving doubts, in his treatise *De Conscientia*. The reason is an illuminating one: "haec omnia pertinent ad moralem specialem, et quidem ad tractatum de virtute cardinali prudentiae cuius actus est conscientia recta et bene formata" (p. 182). The Dominican theologians are not commonly enthusiastic defenders of Probabilism, in spite of the fact that its formulation as a system is usually attributed to a Spanish Dominican. During the time of the great controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they were its most determined opponents. Fr. Prümmer was inclined in favour of a system known as "Compensationism." A clear and simple study of the principles of St. Thomas, for solving doubts of conscience, would be most welcome in theological manuals, for these problems existed and were solved centuries before the wearisome controversies arose at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Fr. Merkelbach's exposition of the subject will be awaited with great interest, but one would not be surprised to learn from him that the virtue of Prudence requires adhesion to the system of Probabilism, since it is almost universally in possession at the moment.

The pressing problems of the moment are, almost unconsciously, turning men's minds to the foundations of the moral law. At the time of the Reformation, the insistent attacks on the Church were the immediate occasion of the great apologetical works of Bellarmine and Stapleton. In a rather similar way, the modern attacks on the moral law evidenced in the propaganda favouring birth control, sterilization and abortion, are likely to be the occasion for a fresher and more scientific study of the Natural Law. We have an important beginning for a study of this character in Dom Lottin's work, *Le Droit Naturel chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin et ses prédécesseurs*.<sup>15</sup> The book is a revised and augmented edition of a series of articles which first appeared in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1924-1926.

<sup>15</sup> Bevaert, 1931.

It is a careful and well-documented examination of the Natural Law in the teaching of St. Thomas, and contains many unpublished texts of the theological writers from whom he, presumably, drew the substance of his own doctrine. It is primarily a work of literary research, tracing the connection between S. Thomas and his predecessors, and demonstrating his preference for the definitions of Roman Law, although the Thomistic notions are often clothed in language which is theological rather than legal. But it is much more than a work of research, pure and simple. For our understanding of this, and other subjects, has progressed very little since the days of S. Thomas, and the modern theologian is usually content to reflect, in his own teaching, some rays from this "lumen Ecclesiae." Dom Lottin's valuable work is indispensable for those moralists who wish to pierce a little more deeply into that scholastic ethical theory, which is the philosophical basis of the moral teaching of the Church.

A new edition of De Becker's treatise on Matrimony is welcome.<sup>19</sup> The book has a particular value for English speaking countries, and more especially for the United States, its author having lectured on the subject for forty years in the American College at Louvain. The text is strictly limited to the canonical aspect of the matter, which is clearly and succinctly outlined, with very few references except to classical sources. The official English translation of *Casti Connubii* is given as an appendix.

Priests are frequently expected to enlighten persons about to marry on everything connected with the civil formalities. A useful and authoritative book for this purpose is *Marriage in Church, Chapel and Registry Office*, by Arthur S. May, M.A., the recent edition of which contains supplementary information concerning the Guardianship of Infants' Act 1925, the Acts of 1921 and 1931 modifying the prohibited degrees, and various other changes connected with the issuing of licenses.<sup>20</sup>

The seventh edition of the treatise on Marriage by Canon A. Gougnard has just appeared.<sup>21</sup> The author is a Professor in the Seminary of Malines and the work forms part of the valuable series *Theologia Mechlinensis*. Every question relating to marriage, whether dogmatic, moral or canonical, is discussed with great completeness and a wealth of reference. The four divisions of the treatise comprise the preliminaries to marriage, the marriage contract-sacrament, impediments and dispensations; of these divisions the second is naturally the fullest. There are some twenty pages of "formulae" and two indices. Throughout this study the author has in mind, primarily, the conditions existing in his great diocese, and consequently we have abundant references to the civil law of Belgium and to the Councils and Collectanea of Malines. For a discriminating

<sup>19</sup> *De Matrimonio, Praelectiones Canonicae*. Louvain, 1931. 334 pages.

<sup>20</sup> Longmans. 96 pages. 3s. 6d.

<sup>21</sup> *Tractatus De Matrimonio*, Dessain, Malines, 1931. 582—viii pages. 45 fr.

English reader this is by no means a disadvantage; in particular, the citations of local ecclesiastical laws are extremely helpful, as representing the interpretation of universal laws followed by a large and important Catholic community. In controverted questions the learned author is not of the company of those who record the opposing views, leaving the reader to take his choice. He follows the more admirable method of stoutly defending one particular solution. He holds, for example, that the judicial pronouncement of a civil divorce is not intrinsically evil, a solution which certainly commends itself to me as the correct one. In the difficult questions connected with co-operation in birth control and the confessor's obligations in the matter, the doctrine is clear and sure. In fact, I do not know of any other book which sets out the problems so attractively. It will be seen, from these examples, that the work is extremely practical and complete and can strongly be recommended to the English clergy.

In the realm of Canon Law, the big event on the horizon is the promised Code of Oriental Church Law. A commission was appointed in 1929 under the presidency of Cardinal Gasparri, whose labours in codifying our Western law had so fruitful a result. Two sub-commissions are preparing the *schemata* with the assistance of an expert in the law of each oriental Church. The labour will be enormous and far more difficult than the work of codifying our own laws, but it will undoubtedly be a great step towards bringing some accurate knowledge of the laws of Eastern Christians to the notice of Western canonists.

Amongst the bewildering variety of manuals and studies in Canon Law, there are three works which are likely to be of interest to the clergy. P. J. Palombo, C.S.S.R., has written a useful practical commentary on Canons 646-672,<sup>22</sup> in which the various canonical causes and processes for dismissing a religious from his Institute are explained and illustrated by a good selection of *formulae*. P. M. Agius, O.E.S.A., offers a quite simple and elementary little manual on the rights and duties of rectors of Churches.<sup>23</sup> Of much more general interest and value is a commentary on Canons 2142-2194, by Fr. Emmanuel Suarez, O.P., of the "Angelico," entitled *De Remotione Parochorum*.<sup>24</sup> Let us allay the suspicion, on the part of the clergy, that here is an attack on the rights and liberties of parish priests. The book could, perhaps, be styled with equal justice "*De Stabilitate Parochorum*." The author has done his work with great thoroughness, both on the historical and the practical side, and the book is well printed and worthily produced. There are some forty pages of "*formulae*" attractively arranged to show the normal course of the rather ponderous canonical processes, and also three "*causes*" reprinted in full from the *Acta*.

<sup>22</sup> *De Demissione Religiosorum*, Marietti, 1931. 296 pages. 12 lire.

<sup>23</sup> *Manuale De Rectoribus Ecclesiarum*, Marietti, 1931. 118 pages. 5 lire.

<sup>24</sup> Rome: Via S. Vitale, 1931. 339 pages. Large 8vo. 32 lire.

Two references have already been made in these notes to the canonical periodical *Apollinaris* (CLERGY REVIEW, I, p. 530; II, p. 439). We may be permitted to call attention to two others. *Jus Pontificium* has been in existence since 1921 and is edited and published by Canon A. Toso, Piazza SS. Apostoli 51; 60 lire annually. It appears irregularly about four times a year, and each number contains a detachable portion of Canon Toso's commentary on the Code, which has now reached Canon 633. The contributors are drawn from among the best Roman Canonists, and particular attention is given to the historical aspect of the questions discussed, many of which have since been published separately. Of even wider utility, perhaps, to the parochial clergy is a series generally cited as *Periodica de Re Canonica et Morali*, which has been in existence, with varying sub-titles, since 1902 and appears (also irregularly) about five times a year. It costs 25 lire annually, and for this small sum one receives the text of any important document issued by the Holy See, as well as topical and practical articles on Moral Theology and Canon Law. It is produced by the Jesuit Fathers of the Gregorian University and, for most of its life, has been under the able editorship of Fr. Vermeersch.

### III. HISTORY.

BY DOUGLAS WOODRUFF, M.A.

The fourth volume of Mr. Belloc's *History of England*<sup>25</sup> covers the reign of Elizabeth, or, as Mr. Belloc says, of the two Cecils, and ends in 1612 with the death of the younger Cecil. No period has been invested with more glamour than the Elizabethan and the Queen herself has become in the ordinary text books a figure of outstanding power and charm, a little fond of admiration but wise and brave and humane. In Mr. Belloc's view the ability belonged to William Cecil, Lord Burghley. The Queen emerges as deserving neither patriotic eulogy nor Catholic execration but as a weak uncertain woman. Step by step Mr. Belloc traces the way in which the severance of the mass of the population from the religion of their fathers was achieved by that astute and tenacious man. Mr. Belloc's sovereign merit as a historian is his power to discount subsequent and interested accounts of the past and to reach behind what may be called the "window-dressing" to the somewhat sordid realities.

The version which he has suspected and combated since his Oxford days is substantially the version which William Cecil himself first put into circulation when he encouraged William Camden to write his *Annals* of the reign of Elizabeth. Many scholars have delved and brought to light particular truths about the change of religion in England and the falsity of the official version has never gone unchallenged since Cobbett. Mr.

<sup>25</sup> Methuen, 1938.



Belloc is sometimes considered over-violent and too decided in his affirmations and too parsimonious with his evidence. But it is the purpose of his work to come as a shock to preconceptions imbibed almost unconsciously. If he seems to leave the middle of the road beloved of Englishmen, when he might occupy it himself, and to take up an extreme view, it is to tempt the official historians to occupy it themselves. Their prejudices incline them one way: he rocks the boat violently in the other direction, that they may hasten to secure themselves in the centre.

How necessary is the work which Mr. Belloc is doing has again been illustrated in the last few months. The publishers of his history are also publishing an eight-volume *History of Mediæval and Modern Europe*, and the fifth volume<sup>26</sup> has just appeared, covering the period 1494-1610. It is by Professor A. J. Grant, a scholar of the older generation, best known for his accounts of French history. Professor Grant does not mean to perpetuate old traditional history and writes in a very fair tone, but his successive bibliographies at the end of the chapters take no proper account of recent scholarship on the sixteenth century. We find Froude and Robertson as the authorities for Erasmus and Charles V and the Council of Trent, and no mention of Mangan on Erasmus, or Evenett's important book on the period of the Council. Neither Grisar nor Denifle are mentioned for Luther. Professor Grant gives no date for the books he recommends for reference and no clue that in too many cases they are misleading. But the important point for Catholics to bear in mind is that even in 1931 the chief books being recommended as covering the whole period are, to take them as they come, in Professor Grant's appendix, by F. Seebohm, who wrote on the Protestant Revolution in the early eighties; by Mandell Creighton, who wrote at the same period, though he revised *The Age of Elizabeth* in successive editions down to 1897; and A. H. Johnson's *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, which is still the text book most used at Oxford, though the Rev. author—he died at an advanced age three years ago—was the quintessence of last century Oxford. The point is not that any of these books have ceased to be worth reading, but that so much has been done since. A successful text-book colours the teaching of a subject for thirty years or more, and the old Protestant ethos which clings round books by Oxford clergymen of the last century is still being communicated to the teachers of to-morrow.

There are some good discussions of Nineteenth Century historians in a work called *War and Peace in Europe, 1815-1870*,<sup>27</sup> by one of the present generation of Oxford historical students, Mr. E. L. Woodward. Mr. Woodward has shown in earlier books a somewhat marked lack of sympathy with the Catholic Church and has a Nineteenth Century liberal outlook, but it

<sup>26</sup> Methuen, 15s.

<sup>27</sup> Constable, 15s.

would be a pity if the tone of his study on the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century should cause Catholic students to recoil from his other work and in particular from his analysis of the conditions under which historical writing was done in the last century. History as a thorough and sustained study is a recent thing, barely two hundred years old, and special causes delayed till late in the last century the formation of senior historical schools at the main English Universities. To-day a great deal of work of the senior monograph type is going forward and though the results take, as we have seen, a long time to reach the class-room, Catholics can feel with some confidence that the partisan versions from which they have suffered so much in this country will be disposed of step by step by scholars outside the Church whose only interest is to establish what did indeed happen. A good instance is *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John*, by Mr. Z. N. Brooke of Cambridge.<sup>28</sup> These Birkbeck lectures establish from close textual study that Roman Canon Law was in force in mediæval England. "I have discovered," he says, "ample evidence to enable me to arrive at a perfectly definite conclusion, which can hardly be affected by any further discoveries. The English Church recognized the same law as the rest of the Church; it possessed and used the same collections of Church Law that were employed in the rest of the Church. There is no shred of evidence to show that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself." Since Maitland's *Canon Law in the Church of England* this conclusion has been challenged, notably by Canon Ogle, and as recently as four years ago in their preface to a re-issue of Lynwood's *Provinciale* two Proctors in the York Convocation attempted to maintain that English Canon Law in the Middle Ages was independent of Rome. Mr. Brooke's book should close a controversy which is not really a major controversy at all.

Dom Bede Camm has continued his long and devoted services to the earthly glory of the English martyrs and has published in *Nine Martyr Monks*<sup>29</sup> studies of the Benedictines beatified in 1929. It is an extraordinarily interesting book, bringing to light much that is wholly new. In particular the life of Blessed John Roberts culminating in his martyrdom at the beginning of James I reign gives a picture of the English Catholics during the uncertain two years of plague and revived persecution between the death of Elizabeth and the Gunpowder Plot which so generally occupies the whole of the account. Blessed John Roberts was arrested in the house of the deserted wife of Thomas Percy, the conspirator, but he had no knowledge of the plot. The ease with which access could be gained to Newgate by friends of prisoners there made possible a remarkable last

<sup>28</sup> Cambridge University Press, 10s. 6d.

<sup>29</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 15s.

supper of the martyr and his companions, and moved James I to particular indignation. There are many parallels between Roberts and Campion, and as Henry Walpole witnessed Campion's martyrdom and then became himself a Jesuit and a martyr, so here Roberts had a disciple who, attending him at his last gathering in Newgate, then at Tyburn, became in his turn another of the Benedictine martyrs, Blessed Maurus Scott. Dom Bede Camm gives us the life of Blessed Mark Barkworth, the first of the Benedictines, a remarkable picture of life at Valladolid in the English College under Jesuit superiors who were not at all easily reconciled to the new zeal for the Benedictine Order which manifested itself among the students. At first to be a monk looked incompatible with being a missionary priest, but it was sufficient to recall St. Augustine to show that it was in fact a particularly happy and well-attested combination.

Two slighter works on great figures of the sixteenth century are *St. Francis Xavier*, by Margaret Yeo,<sup>30</sup> and *St. Peter Canisius*, by Rev. W. Reaney.<sup>31</sup> Margaret Yeo is mistress of a singularly easy narrative style and has re-told one of the great stories of the world in a gravely natural and direct way, free from the edification which is the besetting danger for those who write the life of a saint and, meaning to bring him near, make him in result remote. She leaves her story with the death of St. Francis, which is a reasonably natural thing to do with any life and particularly with a saint's; but it is impossible not to regret the absence of an epilogue on the huge half-forgotten sequel of the Jesuit missions in the East, of which St. Francis Xavier was the morning star.

Dr. Reaney's sketch—it does not profess to be more—of St. Peter Canisius will fill the gap till the standard life upon which Father J. Brodick of Farm Street is engaged is completed. St. Peter Canisius is strangely little known in view of his importance and of the way in which his activities, combating heresy in Germany, in a confused age, by all the resources of pen and voice and printing press, make him the fore-runner of our own day. It does not seem an anachronism to envisage him broadcasting.

Another short saint's life is *St. Hugh of Lincoln*, by Joseph Clayton,<sup>32</sup> which disentangles a great figure from a background which is singularly puzzling to ordinary readers. If in parts the book has the flavour of hagiology, St. Hugh was a saint of the old heroic mould and Mr. Clayton has done well to keep closely to the great *Vita* in which his memory is enshrined.

In *The English Cardinals*<sup>33</sup> Mr. G. C. Heseltine writes sketches

<sup>30</sup> Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

<sup>31</sup> Browne & Nolan. 5s.

<sup>32</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 6s.

<sup>33</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

of the forty or fifty English and American wearers of the Sacred College colours. The sketches are necessarily slight but the book brings back to the memory of Catholics many men great in their day who have been totally forgotten.

An important contribution to the history of the Church in the decades succeeding Emancipation is *A History of Prior Park College*, by the Rev. Brother J. S. Roche.<sup>34</sup> The occasion for this book was the centenary of the College last year. After a history more chequered than that of any other Catholic institution, Prior Park seems at last to have found its vocation as a school under the Christian Brothers. Its early difficulties, under its founder Bishop Baines, who is depicted with much understanding sympathy, are shown to have been due to grandiose conceptions. The attempt to found an imposing seminary-school in the part of England where the Church was most insignificant, did not succeed, and even if the presence of Downside had not aggravated the problem it is unlikely it would have done so. But the whole sad story of repeated failures is one well worth telling both for its intrinsic interest and for a warning against over-ambitious and financially hazardous building ventures which naturally attract lofty and inspiring minds such as Bishop Baines, with all his faults of temperament, undoubtedly possessed.

For librarians and bibliophiles there has appeared from Messrs. Macmillan<sup>35</sup> a singularly delightful study, by Canon B. H. Streeter, of Hereford, of *The Chained Library*, a study of four centuries of library evolution. Profusely illustrated with excellent photographs, his monograph traces the evolution of library furniture which was determined by the great value and rarity of books, which had to be chained and read where they stood. The existing Chained Library of Hereford was the cause of the author interesting himself in the subject, but his enquiries took him all over England; and Lincoln, Oxford and Cambridge all yielded up secrets to his acute detective work, and have enabled him to throw a great deal of light on the physical conditions under which, in Catholic England, learning was pursued.

<sup>34</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne 15s.

<sup>35</sup> 25s.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

### A REVISION OF THE RUBRICS.

The institution, during the present pontificate, of the Feast of Christ the King, and the enhanced splendour of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, with its new Mass and Octave, have necessitated not a few changes in the rubrical framework of the Missal and the Breviary. An authentic list of changes has now been published by decree of the S.C. of Rites, dated November 1st, 1931. It has been thought advisable to transcribe the complete Latin text from the *Acta* (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 447), so that the reader may make the necessary changes for himself, especially since the decree goes beyond its immediate purpose, and includes several other alterations of particular interest.

The new rubric for Ash Wednesday, for example, will affect all priests who have to carry out the day's ceremonies single-handed. Other minute changes will hardly concern any but the professed student of liturgy or the diocesan Kalendarist.

#### I. THE CALENDAR.

In Kalendario, ad calcem mensis Maii, supprimatur: "Feria VI post Octavam . . . Duplex I classis."

#### II. THE BREVIARY.

##### (i) *The Additiones et Variationes. Duæ Tabellæ.*

In additamentis et variationibus Tit. III, *De Octavis*, n. 2, post verba "Octava Ascensionis" addatur "atque Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu." In tit. VI, *De concurrentia Festorum*, n. 4, expungantur verba "Attamen in die Octava . . . Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu." In tit. VII, *De Commemorationibus*, n. 5, post verba "de die infra Octavam Nativitatis Domini vel Ascensionis" addatur "vel Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu."

Feriae privilegiatae ita enuntientur: "Feria quarta Cinerum. Feriae omnes Maioris Hebdomadae."

Inter duplicia I classis primaria post Festum Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, addatur "Festum Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu." Expungatur "Duplex I classis secundarium . . ." Post festa feriata: "Festum feriatis aequiparatum: Festum Ssmi Cordis Iesu." Octavae III ordinis ita enuntientur: "Octava Nativitatis Domini. Octava Ascensionis Domini. Octava Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu."

In tabella occurrentiae loco "0," quod legitur in interferentia Vigiliae cum die infra Octavam III ordinis, ponatur "4."

Inter *Notanda in praecedentes tabellas* n. 13, expungantur verba "et tunc in II Vesperis . . . sine ulla Commemoratione."

(ii) *The Ordinarium.*

In Ordinario divini Officii, quoties in rubricis legitur "ac Ssmi Corporis Christi," dicatur "Ssmi Corporis Christi ac Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu." Ibidem, in rubrica ante lectionem brevem *Dominus autem dirigat*, loco verborum "a Feria VI post Octavam Sanctissimi Corporis Christi" dicatur "a Dominica IV post Pentecosten."

(iii) *The Psalterium.*

In Psalterio Breviarii Romani, quoties in Rubricis legitur "in Dominica III et reliquis post Pentecosten," dicatur "in Dominica IV et reliquis post Pentecosten." Ibidem, quoties in Rubricis legitur "ac Sanctissimi Corporis Christi," dicatur "Sanctissimi Corporis Christi ac Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu."

(iv) *Holy Week. The Monday after Trinity Sunday.*

Rubrica ante Feriam II Maioris Hebdomadae ita emendetur: "Omnes Ferae huius Hebdomadae sunt maiores privilegiatae." Rubrica in Feria II infra Hebdomadam I post Octavam Pentecostes sic reformetur: "Responsoria . . . ponuntur cum suis lectionibus in Feria III aut IV, si hae lectiones in alterutra resumendae sunt iuxta Rubricas; secus omittantur."

(v) *The Octaves of Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart.*

In die Octava Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, expuncta veteri Rubrica, ponantur lectiones sequentis Ferae VI cum Responsoriis de Octava. In fine addatur: "Vesperae de sequenti." In Feria VI post Octavam Corporis Christi ponatur novum Officium Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu cum tota Octava. Post diem Octavam addatur Rubrica: "Ad Vesperas, nisi sequenti die persolvendum sit Officium de Festo novem lectionum aut de qualibet Octava vel Vigilia, fit Commemoratio de Sancta Maria, et de ea dicitur Officium in Sabbato sequenti. Quod item servatur . . ." (ut antea legebatur sub Feria VI post Octavam Corporis Christi). Rubrica posita ad Vesperas Sabbati post Dominicam II post Pentecosten, omittatur, et ponatur ad Vesperas Sabbati sequentis cum oratione *Da nobis*. Rubrica quae invenitur in Dominica III ponatur in Dominica IV.

(vi) *The Feast of Christ the King.*

In Rubrica posita sub Feria V Hebdomadae IV Octobris, loco verborum "sumuntur lectiones Dominicae V et Ferae II et III eiusdem Hebdomadae" dicatur "sumuntur lectiones Ferae II et III et IV Hebdomadae V Octobris." Sub Dominica V Octobris substituatur haec Rubrica: "In Dominica occurrente a die 25 ad diem 31 Octobris inclusive, recolitur Festum Domini



Nostri Iesu Christi Regis, ut in Proprio Sanctorum notatur." Lectiones II Nocturni de eadem Dominica supprimantur. Lectiones autem I Nocturni de hac Dominica ponantur in Feria II, lectiones Feriae II in Feria III, lectiones Feriae III in Feria IV, suppressis veteribus lectionibus Feriae IV. Ante lectiones Feriae II ponatur Rubrica: "Lectiones huic Feriae et duabus sequentibus Feriis assignatae, si suis diebus dici nequeant, ponuntur . . ." (ut antea legebatur sub Dominica V Octobris).

### III. THE MISSAL.

#### (i) *The Additiones et Variationes.*

In novis Rubricis, Tit. V, *De commemorationibus*, n. 1, ad calcem addatur: "De Festis autem Domini in quavis Dominica minore vel in Vigilia Epiphaniae occurrentibus fit Commemoratio etiam in Missis cantatis vel conventualibus Duplicium I classis, si facta fuerit in Officio." In eodem titulo V, n. 3, loco verborum "de Dominica quavis, de Feria maiori" dicatur "de Dominica quavis, etiam anticipata, et, ante Commemorationem Dominicae minoris vel Vigiliae Epiphaniae, de quolibet Festo Domini occurrente, de Feria maiori."

In titulo VI, *De Orationibus*, n.4, ad calcem, loco verborum "Festo Ssmae Trinitatis et Festo Ssmi Corporis Christi" dicatur "atque in Festis Ssmae Trinitatis, Ssmi Corporis Christi, Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu et Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Regis."

In titulo VIII, *De Praefatione*, n.1, loco verborum "item pro Dominica infra Octavam Corporis Christi" dicatur "item pro Dominica infra Octavam tam Corporis Christi quam Cordis Iesu." Ibidem, loco verborum "si Commemoratio Octavae Corporis Christi sit omittenda, in Dominica II post Pentecosten" dicatur "si Commemoratio Octavae Corporis Christi vel Cordis Iesu sit omittenda, in Dominica II et III post Pentecosten." In titulo X, *De colore paramentorum*, n.1, loco verborum "praeter Missam de Dominica infra Octavam Corporis Christi" dicatur "praeter Missam de Dominica infra Octavam tam Corporis Christi quam Cordis Iesu."

#### (ii) *Ash Wednesday.*

Sub Feria IV Cinerum, in Rubrica posita ante Antiphonam *Immutemur habitu*, loco verborum "genibus flexis coram altari" dicatur "ad altare conversus."

#### (iii) *Mass and Preface of the Sacred Heart.*

In Rubrica posita ante Praefationem de Sancta Cruce, n.1, expungantur verba "de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu." Post Cordis Iesu." Post Secretam autem addatur "Praefatio de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu. In Rubrica posita ante Praefationem de Sanctissima Trinitate, loco verborum "exclusa pariter Missa

Dominicae II post Pentecosten . . . de Nativitate Domini ” dicatur “ exclusa pariter Missa Dominicae II et III post Pentecosten, in qua, si omittenda non sit commemoratio Octavae Sanctissimi Corporis Christi vel Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, sumitur Praefatio de respectiva Octava.”

Ante Dominicam II post Pentecosten ponatur nova Missa Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu. In Missa Dominicae infra Octavam Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, tertiae post Pentecosten, post primam Orationem addatur : “ Et fit commemoratio Octavae Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu.” Post Secertam autem addatur “ Praefatio de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu, ratione Octavae; sed si commemoratio Octavae sit omittenda, dicitur Praefatio de Ssma Trinitate, iuxta Rubricas.”

In Missa de Festo Eucharistici Cordis Iesu, quae est in Appendice Missalis, post Secretam ponatur Rubrica : “ Praefatio de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu.”

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Evolution and Theology: the Problem of Man's Origin.* By the Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. (Louvain). (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 313. 12s. 6d.)

The importance of Dr. Messenger's recent work has been already recognized; it may, in fact, prove to be epoch-making, as if the author's thesis is at all widely accepted, and if it receives at least the tacit approbation of ecclesiastical authority, it will be scarcely possible to maintain in future that there is much foundation for attaching any note of theological censure to theories of "moderate Transformism" of plants and the lower animals or to a certain modified transformist theory of the evolution of the human body.

It is necessary to understand clearly the object of the book. Dr. Messenger does not set out the biological arguments on which evolutionary hypotheses are founded, though he makes no secret of his own acceptance of a hypothesis of this kind as the most satisfactory explanation of the relationships between the species of the animal and plant kingdoms as a whole. With regard to the evolution of the human body the author is not prepared to take so definite an attitude; while agreeing with modern anthropologists that certain facts do point in that direction, he is, one gathers, not perfectly convinced that other explanations are impossible. He is, however, in sympathy with the attempt to frame a hypothesis on evolutionary lines which would take into account the unique nature of the soul of man. Nor does the author deal with the purely philosophical objections that are brought forward by those Catholic manuals which follow the conventional lines. Information on such matters, and consideration of these difficulties will have to be sought elsewhere, notably in the work of Canon Dorlodot, although Dr. Messenger does not follow this author in all matters. His aim is theological, namely, to consider whether Divine Revelation in Scripture and Tradition implies that evolution is *not* true, and must therefore be rejected by a Catholic whatever arguments from natural science may be alleged in favour of it.

It is plain that an acceptance of Dr. Messenger's thesis, that Revelation does not exclude the activity of secondary causes, such as evolution, in the formation of species, does not necessarily imply that in fact these secondary causes have operated. Biological proofs would still have to be given, and biological and philosophical difficulties still have to be met. The subject would, however, be removed from the theological field; Catholic evolutionists would be able to express their theories freely, and perhaps a tendency on the part of anti-

Catholic writers to support evolutionary theories at all costs as supposedly contradictory of the Catholic religion might henceforth be modified. If the author's thesis is accepted, a very considerable modification of the usual Catholic attitude towards theories of Transformism is likely to follow.

It should also be understood that the type of evolutionary theory that the author defends as theologically permissible is by no means a type that would appeal to a Keith or a Wells. Throughout, of course, evolution is represented merely as a secondary cause, dependant in every way on the First Cause, God. In addition, the author posits a definite miraculous activity in the formation of Man. A human body could not be informed by a sub-human soul (it is better to avoid the misleading term "ape"), nor could a human soul inform a sub-human body. If Adam derived his body from sub-human parents, a mutation must have taken place in his conception that would appear to surpass the powers of nature, and would amount to a miraculous interposition on the part of God. In addition further miracles would seem to be requisite to account for the education of this human child amid sub-human surroundings; and, lastly, there is the miraculous and quite non-human (*quoad modum*) origin of Eve, which the author fully admits. It must not therefore be imagined that by the acceptance of Dr. Messenger's thesis all evolutionary difficulties as to the origin of the human body are dispelled. In fact, it may be doubted whether the modern anthropological school would recognize the author's theory as coming under the head of evolution at all, as they would understand the word. There is nothing here of the slow accumulation of slight mutations, gradually fixing themselves as hereditary characteristics under the Mendelian law; but a sudden miraculous change immediately effected by God, with the mating of the first man with a woman also miraculously formed from himself. In the author's theory there is indeed a genetic connection of the body of Adam with his sub-human progenitors, but the mode in which his "evolution" took place has little in common with the popular theory of the present day.

The author, of course, makes his position clear enough to the careful reader, and the whole work is to be regarded as no mere effort in popularization, but as a scientific treatise addressed primarily to the theologian. At the same time, it might perhaps be suggested that for the sake of the inexpert reader the width of the chasm between the transformism suggested as possible by Dr. Messenger, and the evolution assumed, say, by Dr. Barnes of Birmingham, might be still more clearly indicated. There can be no doubt that recent work by "Catholic Evolutionists," including the work under review, has had a profound influence on the younger generation of Catholics in this country. The reviewer had recently to read over a thousand essays sent in from nearly every Catholic secondary school in the country. A certain proportion of the

candidates chose subjects which led to some discussion of the question of evolution, and it was surprising to note the unanimity in which at least the possibility of the evolution of the human body was taken for granted. This was not the case even a couple of years ago. For the most part the young people made the necessary distinctions, such as that between the origin of the human body and of the soul, but in some cases a crude idea was prevalent that "the Church now says that Darwinism is true." The idea of "special creation" in the case of plants and animals has plainly taken its place alongside of the Ptolemaic theory of astronomy in the minds of the younger generation of educated Catholics, a fact which the clergy will have to bear in mind in preaching to the faithful. While not limiting the freedom of discussion that to-day the Church seems willing to grant, they may find it desirable to point out the limits to the action of secondary causes in the matter of the origin of man.

These remarks do not apply in the same degree to the origin of the species of plants and irrational animals; there is not much divergence here (if any) between the view which Dr. Messenger passes as theologically lawful and that which might be held by any evolutionist who was also a believer in God. There cannot be much doubt that he proves his case, and that there is no scriptural or traditional ground for rejecting the possibility of the action of secondary causes in the formation of such new species, which in practice would amount to a possibility of the action of evolution. The matter must then be decided on philosophical and biological grounds, and perhaps theologians had better leave the matter to the experts in those sciences. One may say in passing that there is still plenty of work to be done; that there is some genetic connection between the various species of the plant and animal world seems to be as well established as any hypothesis of the nature well can be, but the nature of that connection is still obscure. One chief puzzle in many cases is to know in which direction evolution is proceeding. The older evolutionists envisaged the matter as a continual progress from imperfect to more perfect forms, a hypothesis which raised protests from our philosophers. There seems to be a growing school to-day, at any rate among botanists, that regards the formation of new species as rather a continual degradation. There appear to be occasional and remarkable uplifts, as it were, whereby very great and new perfection is achieved, these taking place, it seems, with great rapidity, with intermediate stages very hard to trace. Afterwards, for many ages, the descendants of these newly-perfected forms gradually slide downwards, until a further uplift comes about.

Dr. Messenger starts with a most careful discussion of the pertinent Biblical passages, and then proceeds to the consideration of the teaching of the Fathers. Perhaps his most important witness is St. Gregory of Nyssa, who certainly would seem to have taught that a *potentia activa* was implanted in the world

when first created, whereby the species of living things were produced, through the action of secondary causes, when the due time came. Though St. Gregory had no conception of evolutionary theories, yet it may be agreed that he would not have found them very alien to his own point of view. The famous *rationes seminales* of St. Augustine are naturally discussed, and in opposition to some recent work Dr. Messenger gives what appear to be sound reasons for considering that they also represent a *potentia activa* whereby secondary causes under divine guidance can bring fresh forms of being into actuality. The later schoolmen, led by Blessed Albert the Great and St. Thomas himself, however, were disposed to deny that terrestrial elements could play an active part in the origin of living beings, so that at least the higher animals must have been created directly by God. Dr. Messenger, however, gives reasons for thinking that this view is in the nature of a deduction from the biology of Aristotle, who held that the "stars" (i.e., natural forces according to our ideas) could indeed produce living things, but that creatures so produced would be incapable of reproducing their kind. The higher animals, therefore, who plainly do reproduce themselves, must have been immediately created. As, however, this particular theory is now obsolete, the necessary allowances must be made in estimating the present validity of the teaching of the Angelic Doctor upon the point. This appears a reasonable argument, though it will be interesting to see the matter discussed by Thomistic experts.

One highly ingenious argument of the author does not, however, appear to be valid. St. Thomas (I, q. 91, art. 2) speaks of the form of Adam's body as a *forma quae est in materia*. From this St. Thomas argues that the angels could not produce such a body, being themselves immaterial forms, as the agent must be similar to the thing made. But, argues Dr. Messenger, the form of a human body is the soul, which is not a material but an immaterial and spiritual form. St. Thomas, therefore, is positing a sub-human body, on the way to becoming a human body, which is not yet informed by the human soul of Adam, but by a *forma materialis*, or purely sensitive soul. Against this suggestion by our author, it may be argued that St. Thomas elsewhere explicitly describes the human soul as *in materia* (e.g., I, q. 76, art 1 ad 1); the soul is *in materia* as the form of the body, but a *forma separata* as to its intellectual power. Consequently, St. Thomas's (perfectly valid) argument against the angelic formation of man's body would still hold good, without the necessity of introducing a sub-human body, of which we hear nothing else whatever from the Angelic Doctor.

An interesting feature of the book is the very careful discussion of the alleged Roman condemnations of works that taught evolutionary doctrine from a Catholic standpoint. It is plain that the action taken in reality amounted to little. Nothing about any of these incidents ever appeared in any official journal of the Holy See, and in fact all that was done was a private



and personal request on the part of Roman officials (who they were seems doubtful) that certain books should be withdrawn from publication. It is plain from canon 17 that such actions have not the force of law, and in any case greater reticence on this subject may well have been desirable thirty years ago, when Catholic opinion on the matter was quite uninstructed.

There can be no doubt that the crux for Catholics who desire to maintain the evolution of man is the question of the formation of Eve. This is not merely a matter of the verse in Genesis which speaks of the formation of Eve from Adam's rib, nor of the decision of the Biblical Commission on the matter. It might, for example, come about that possible further knowledge of current Semitic thought of the time when the account was drawn up would considerably change the attitude of the Catholic exegete. But there is also marked biological difficulty, which does seem to preclude the possibility of the evolution of the human body having proceeded in accordance with normal methods. A new mutation only takes place in *one* individual, in the case of plants and lower animals; the individual mating with a normal partner who does not possess the newly-developed character. The result is a hybridization between the new and the old. If the resulting hybrid offspring chance to mate in turn, then ultimately through the laws discovered by the Abbot Mendel, a race will result in which the new characters are fixed as a quasi-specific character. After a succession of such mutations a new species may result. But no such relations could be thought as possible between man and the sub-humans from which he may be thought to have sprung.

How then could the "help-mate" of Adam be found? It might have been suggested that the identical mutation from sub-human to human took place (miraculously) in two individuals of opposite sexes. In this case, Adam would have no claim to be the sole head of mankind, especially as it is now clear that in generation the female sex plays an active part, and not a purely passive one, as was thought by Aristotle and St. Thomas. Dr. Messenger suggests that in accordance with the hint given by Scripture, Eve was formed asexually from Adam's body, diploid cells (presumably) being miraculously multiplied so that Eve's body would possess precisely the same characteristics as that of Adam. The author suggests that this would not surpass the virtuality of the higher vertebrates, though it would be most extraordinary and would require the special activity of the First Cause. In support of this he alleges the fact of parthenogenesis, which has been produced experimentally in the case of some lower vertebrates. Here we cannot follow him; the parthenogenetic frog is produced from the haploid ovum, and would have nothing really in common with a case of gemmation from diploid cells, which is what the author appears to be suggesting. In other words the formation of Eve would be absolutely supernatural, and if this is the case, it would appear to lessen the probability for the

action of secondary causes in the formation of the body of Adam. For if, after all, there was to be a complete break in the evolutionary process, would it not appear more *conveniens* that it should take place in the case of Adam himself? A good deal of further consideration is due to this matter; one is inclined to think that the solution propounded is one likely to scandalize the evolutionists without quite satisfying the conservative theologians.

It may be hoped that Dr. Messenger will follow up this work with a further one, in which he will discuss the biological aspects of the matter, and deal with the difficulties which arise in this way. It is unreasonable to expect an exposition of the matter in the work under review, which deals rather hypothetically with the subject, whether *if* a biologically satisfactory theory were suggested, it would still be irreconcilable with the deposit of faith. Nor does Dr. Messenger commit himself to an acceptance of the suggestions that he tentatively makes. An acceptance of the genetic interdependence of the lower animals is not irreconcilable with a belief in the immediate formation of the body of man by God. Man is an animal, and it is intended by God that he should realize this. But if the only animal life extant were, say, the crustacea and the mollusca, the gulf between them and man would be so immense that it would be hard for him to trace his own animal instincts in them. It may well be imagined that God so directed the course of evolution that animals which might be described as sub-human came into existence, possessing nearly, but not quite, the human configuration, without the rational soul. Man in that way could not help perceiving his resemblance on one side to the brutes, and his difference from them in his possession of intellect and free-will. But perhaps, after all, for the final step, a break in the chain of evolution was necessary.

P. G. M. RHODES.

*Mysterium Fidei de Augustissimo Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Sacrificio atque Sacramento.* By Père M. de la Taille, S.J. *Editio tertia, cui accedit Vindictiarum liber unus.* (Beauchesne, Paris. pp. xv, 773.)

The purpose of this notice is not to discuss the theory which has made Père de la Taille's name famous throughout the theological world, but to indicate what supplementary matter will be found in this third edition compared with the first edition. The storm of admiration and protestation that has raged around this book during the last decade now shows signs of abating. No longer is its main theory spoken of as "heretical," as "about to be condemned," as already "condemned by the Council of Trent," or even as "highly dangerous." The theory has obviously come to stay. Indirectly the controversy has had the beneficial effect of clearing the air of certain other theories: the "status declivior," the "status cibalis," the "destructio hostiae per Communionem."

and the "banquet" theory, all seem to have disappeared for good. At the same time, to those who have not handled this fine volume, the controversy may have given the impression that the book is wholly occupied with the one theory; whereas the truth is that every aspect of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Sacrament is viewed; so that even those who have strongly attacked the main theory have not been slack in admitting that the work is an admirable presentation of Eucharistic teaching.

By careful location of the additions at the end of the "Elucidationes," where space was vacant, the original pagination has been retained, and references to the first edition need no change. At the end of the fourth elucidation (p. 64-65) is inserted a long quotation from Cardinal Manning's *The Glories of the Sacred Heart*. The opinion of Gropper (afterwards Cardinal) of Cologne, at the Council of Trent, is added to the sixth elucidation (p. 82-83). A note on p. 116 considers the sense of the particles *etsi . . . tamen* in the Tridentine passage that has been much discussed in the recent controversy. On p. 151 a long footnote is inserted in further explanation of the text above. To the fifteenth elucidation a note is added on the opinion of Grimal (p. 180); and a long note is appended to the twenty-second elucidation (p. 292). The matter is lengthened on pp. 300, 301.

But the chief feature of the third edition is a supplement of more than a hundred pages, in which the main thesis is "vindicated" against recent attacks. These "vindiciae" are reduced to four chapters. The first (pp. 653-667) deals with the vital distinction between oblation and immolation. The second (pp. 669-703) is mainly concerned with the points raised by Père Lepin in his book *L'Idée du Sacrifice de la Messe*. The third (pp. 705-741) illustrates Catholic teaching on the Supper and the Passion against the arguments of the Protestants, before, during, and after the Council of Trent. In the final "antirrheticum" (pp. 743-756) arguments brought against the theory by Mgr. C. J. Cronin (in the *Oscotian*, 1927) are discussed. At the head of p. 392 read xxxii instead of xxxiii.

T. E. BIRD.

*Le Rôle de l'Analogie en Théologie Dogmatique*, by the Rev. M. Penido, of the University of Fribourg. (1. vol., pp. 478. Vrin, Paris. Price not indicated.)

Let me say at the outset that this is a brilliant and important study on the part played by Analogy in theological speculation. The author is quite young, but, inspired by the example and encouragement of men like the late Fr. del Prado, O.P., has devoted some years of hard study to this absorbing yet difficult problem. The first chapter treats of the *préliminaires philosophiques* and is a work of art! It deals with the nature and divisions of Analogy, the proportional unity of the analogical

concept, the importance of "vulgar" analogies, etc. Certainly, I have never yet read so clear, so concise and so ably illustrated an exposition of the difference between the analogies of "attribution" and of "proportionality." To my mind it is a fault observable in most theological manuals of to-day that comparatively little space is given to the explanation of this very profound distinction. Perhaps the theologians are not to blame for this—*spectat ad philosophos*—and so they count it done. . . . *O curas hominum!* In the second chapter Fr. Penido discusses the rôle of Analogy in our natural knowledge of the Deity and shows how St. Thomas keeps to the *via media* between anthropomorphism on the one hand and symbolism (agnosticism in its various forms) on the other. The Anthropomorphist—a horrible word on a typewriter!—claims to know God as he knows himself: for him transcendental notions are univocal. The Symbolist, closing his eyes in mock humility, knows nothing about God: for him transcendental notions are equivocal. In analysing the theological speculations of that great Jewish thinker Maimonides (the Rabbi Moyses of St. Thomas) the author has done a great service, and even if his book contained nothing else of value, this brilliant excursion into Metaphysics would have made it worth while, for Maimonides was the mediæval counterpart of M. E. Le Roy, the *antesignanus* of philosophic Modernism, which, in France, at any rate, is anything but dead. When, for example, Le Roy renewed two years ago his 1907 attack on the traditional proofs of the existence of God, his book (*Le Problème de Dieu*) ran through seven editions in eight months! It has now been condemned.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, a distinction between the symbolism of the Rabbi and that of men like Le Roy: the former is based on metaphor and even on the analogy of "attribution" (cf. St. Thomas, *De Ver.*, q. II, a. 1), whereas the symbolism of Le Roy too often rests on complete equivocation—in God there is nothing at all that corresponds to our ideas of Him, "*la ressemblance n'est que dans notre action, dans notre manière de nous comporter*" (Le Roy, *Dogme et Critique*, p. 147). The Thomist, says Fr. Penido, is neither anthropomorphist nor symbolist, "*parcequ'il échappe à ces deux excès opposés d'abord en dégageant l'âme de vérité qui est en chacun, puis en construisant une doctrine de la transcendance analogique qui sauvegarde et les exigences de la suréminence divine et celles de l'intelligence humaine.*"

The second part of this book is concerned with the application of the doctrine of Analogy to various revealed truths, viz., the Trinity, Creation, Incarnation, etc., but space unhappily forbids further detailed comment on my part. Suffice it to say that the author continues to the end as profoundly as he begins, though, to be sure, the reader has at times to concentrate very closely on what is being said. This book is no primer. I would congratulate Fr. Penido on his intimate acquaintance with the

<sup>1</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, December, 1931, p. 553.

writings of modern theologians and philosophers, Catholic and Heterodox, French, German, Italian, English and American. Not only has he succeeded in giving the lie to those who assert that the modern Thomist is behind the times, but he forcibly brings home to one the meaning of the phrase *Philosophia perennis*.

But I have a serious criticism to pass on the way the book has been printed. The proof-reading has been shockingly lax. In the first hundred pages or so I noticed such a plethora of mistakes in spelling, punctuation and spacing, that I began to count them . . . and soon abandoned an unprofitable task. It is irritating, to put it mildly, to be confronted with a full-stop in the midst of some abstruse sentence; indeed, it is like being hit between the eyes by an invisible brick!

R. W. MEAGHER.

*What Shall We Have To-day?* By X. Marcel Boulestin.  
(Heinemann. pp. viii. and 252. 5s. net.)

Monsieur Boulestin is one of the most brilliant cooks and writers upon cuisine at present in practice. Therefore, a book like this, with its 365 recipes for the year, might be thought to appeal chiefly to the gourmet. But not so. There is a certain fundamental simplicity in the art of cooking, no less in the French than in the English cuisine, though both may be elaborated. The art is largely a matter of grasping certain first principles and mastering half a dozen "main culinary processes." This done, good cooking will result, wholesome and attractive, and waste of every kind will be eliminated. Monsieur Boulestin explains these processes in a preliminary chapter, followed by another on "the tricks of the trade." Fortified by these any cook who has common sense and will take pains will be able to use the recipes that follow to the great advantage in comfort, health and pocket of her employer. Thus the book is as suitable for a presbytery as for a West End club, and even more so, for it is abstinence food that most needs those "tricks of the trade" that make all the difference. A vegetable soup of the sort shown on pp. 25-6 is a good lunch or supper in itself followed by bread and cheese. Recipes for nearly twenty of these soups are given, as well as plenty of egg, cheese and vegetable dishes. So no one need eat fish on a Friday who dislikes it. But for those who like it there is liberal provision here of nourishing dishes, making unnecessary the reappearance of sodden cod on a watery dish.

H. S. D.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### "LITTLE SHOWING."

FROM THE REV. GERALD FLANAGAN, St. Mary's Convent, Lowestoft.

From the excellent sketches of the "Men of Little Showing" as well as from observation in England and Ireland one learns of the growth of a habit of an almost fierce shyness, of extreme reticence in regard to one's love of Our Divine Lord and Our Blessed Lady. I would be very grateful if you could tell me if this is to be considered a good thing or a bad thing. It seems to the present writer that in this extreme form it is an evil born of penal conditions and of the pressure from the Protestant society in which we have had perforce to live. Readers of the history of Pre-Reformation England tell us it was not characteristic of our people in those days.

Bishop Hedley, too, who was no enemy of the virtue of reticence complains of the seemingly cold way many good priests say Mass.<sup>1</sup> I suggest that there is an art of showing one's genuine attitude in such a way as to inspire the weak and shame the tepid. Of course, some are temperamentally incapable of showing enthusiasm. But is it not likely that in many cases this temperamental incapacity has been produced by the bad tradition?

But my chief reasons for writing are other than these. Owing to this extreme reticence there is no genuine discussion about the spiritual life or the handing down of the higher spiritual tradition. The result seems to be that *as a body* we are a lot of timid amateurs in regard to anything but the most ordinary spirituality.

My other reason is that in these days when we see the growth of the very fervent religion of Communism we must surely show the young that the Truth surpasses it in adventurous enthusiasm. None the less, I am genuinely seeking information and have not the least desire to lay down the law.

<sup>1</sup> *Spiritual Retreat for Priests*, p. 145.



.  
,  
s  
e  
r  
e  
t  
n  
e  
.  
it

f  
s  
s  
e  
f  
s  
d

g  
it  
l  
t  
y

h  
w  
l.  
e

=

=